FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 137

17 July 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Romantsov Comments on Arms Negotiations AA 1
Ponomarev Criticizes U.S. Nuclear Test Blast AA 1
UN CW Resolution Dependent on U.S. Stand [Tsvetov] AA 2
Commentator Views International Scientists Forum [Kolesnichenko] AA 3
Zholkver, Agayants Denounce FRG SDI Participation AA 4
Article Calls for 'New Approach' to World Security [Kokoshin in PRAVDA 11 Jul] AA 5
Academician Views Nuclear Disarmament Issues [Goldnaskiy in IZVESTIYA 11 Jul] AA 8
Comparison of Chernyshev Commentary on MBFR Talks AA 9

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'Studio 9' Program on East-West Relations [Arbatov, Falin, Zorin, Bahr, Owen] CC 1
Nuclear Official Urges International Standards CC 19
Expanding Application of IAEA Proposed [Kuchinov in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA 27 Jun] CC 19

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Meets Pakistan's Prime Minister Junejo A 1
Visit Viewed [Adrianov] A 1
Dobrynin Receives Former President Nixon A 2
U.S. Maneuvers off Thailand, Libya Denounced [Solton] A 2
Commentator Notes U.S. 'Isolation' at UN [Glebov] A 3
U.S. Committee Opposes Disarmament Agreement [Turkatenko] A 4
Correction to U.S. Rejection of Mideast Proposal A 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

Gerasimov Criticizes Japanese Military Policies C 1
Mongolian Leader Conveys Message of Thanks [PRAVDA 12 Jul] C 1
Mongolian Ambassador Lauds Bilateral Relations C 3
U.S., ROK 'Obstructionist Stance' Criticized [PRAVDA 14 Jul] C 3
DPRK Condemns U.S. Refusal to Negotiate C 4

SOUTH ASIA

PDPA Central Committee Plenum Held in Kabul [PRAVDA 12 Jul] D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further on Ryzhkov Delegation Hanoi Visit E 1
Heng Samrin Meeting E 1
Meeting With Lao Leader E 1
Departure for Moscow E 2
Stopover in Tashkent E 2
Met in Moscow E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Marchuk Receives Romanian Science Official [IZVESTIYA 13 Jul] F 1
Sokolov, Kulikov Receive GDR State Awards [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jul] F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Reportage on Conclusion of Shevardnadze's UK Visit G 1
London Press Conference G 1
Departs London 16 July G 4
Arrives in Moscow G 4
Sokolov Visits Finnish Air Force Unit G 4
Orlov-Led Delegation Ends Visit to Turkey G 4
Met by Tulkunov Upon Arrival G 5
Gorbachev Message Given to Netherlands Minister G 5
Mitterrand's Appreciation for Gorbachev Talks Noted G 5
Supreme Soviet Greets Mitterrand on Bastille Day [PRAVDA 14 Jul] G 5
French Consultations Show Common Goals [Tumanov] G 6
PRAVDA Reports U.S.-Spanish Talks on Bases [Chernyshev, 13 Jul] G 7
Greek Rejection of U.S. Arms Upgrading Assessed [Miroshnik in PRAVDA 12 Jul] G 8
FRG's Assistance to Afghan Rebels Criticized [Vavilov] G 8
Briefs: Sports Cooperation With Malta G 9

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Nigerian Delegation Meets With Ryzhkov, Arkhipov J 1
Talk With Ryzhkov J 1
Arkhipov Meeting J 1
Mali President Visits Volgograd, Ashkhabad J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Communique Marks Brazilian Parliamentarians' Visit K 1
NEW TIMES Conducts Interview With Nicaragua's Ortega K 1
U.S. Bars Cuban Scientist From Honolulu Meeting K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Shalayev Reports to 11th AUCCTU Plenum
[TRUD 5 Jul] R 1
Practices of Kirghiz Writers Union Criticized
[Samoylenko in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 16 Jul] R 6
PRAVDA Reports Ukrainian CP CC Plenum
[Odinets, 12 Jul] R 11
Leadership Signs Academician Melentyev Obituary
[PRAVDA 12 Jul] R 13
Georgian Komsomol First Secretary Transferred R 13

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU CC Discusses 1986 Economic Progress S 1

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Shortcomings Revealed in Feed Procurement
[Glinka in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Jul] T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmonauts End 125-Day Orbital Mission U 1
Land Near Arkalyk U 1
TV Reports Return [Galkin] U 1
Kizim, Solovyev Decorated U 2

ROMANTSOV COMMENTS ON ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

LD170610 Moscow TASS in English 0606 GMT 17 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 17 TASS -- The Soviet Union's stand at the talks in Geneva, Vienna and Stockholm "on any issue -- whether it is a reduction in the armed forces in central Europe, confidence-and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe, or nuclear and space weapons -- is based on the peaceful Leninist policy and was embodied in a range of far-reaching initiatives and proposals", Yuriy Romantsov writes in the newspaper "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA" today. "The same stand is held by the entire socialist community, which was graphically manifest in the documents of the recent Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, which in their essence constitute a general plan of ridding mankind of the most deadly means of warfare", he pointed out.

Indicating that the fifth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments ended in Geneva, Romantsov writes: "Deplorably, no changes which would contribute towards reaching mutually acceptable accords have occurred in the stand of the U.S. delegation. As a matter of fact, the U.S. side has failed to table so far any positive proposals. What is more, it dodges in any way a businesslike consideration of the Soviet initiatives".

Washington has recently announced at the highest level that it abandons further compliance with the agreements in the field of the limitation of strategic offensive armaments concluded between the USSR and the United States, the author of the article writes. "Voices ring out increasingly louder in the United States which advocate a breach of the timeless treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems which would dramatically undermine strategic stability in the world and would magnify the risk of a nuclear war".

"A legitimate question arises: What are the goals by which the United States is actually guided at the talks? Does it want new agreements with the Soviet Union or intends to use the dialogue as a smokescreen for covering up the arms race? It looks so far that a semblance of a search for new approaches rather than search itself suits more the United States". In this connection Romantsov emphasizes: "If Washington heeds numerous calls by the international public and reasonable voices in the United States itself, a hope for a safer future will then emerge and the talks will surely produce concrete positive results".

PONOMAREV CRITICIZES U.S. NUCLEAR TEST BLAST

LD161542 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev;

An underground nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site in the United States is slated for tomorrow. Despite the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear blasts, in effect since August 6 last year, the Washington administration demonstratively ignores the example of goodwill on the part of the USSR.

Why this provocative behaviour in Washington, the more so, for the majority of Americans are, at present, in favour of joining the Soviet moratorium?

The U.S. leaders are building up the country's military might in order to exert political and military pressure throughout the world. They remain prisoners of the illusions that the world is the U.S. domain.

The world is no longer what Washington thinks it is. As to the Soviet Union, it proceeds in its policy from real changes. What are they?

In its scientific and technological development, mankind has already designed weapons that would bring, once used, unpredictable consequences. Security on our planet should be one for all. In order to start the process of ensuring this kind of security, it is necessary to give up the further arms race, start real disarmament and diminish the risk of nuclear war.

According to the Soviet side, ending nuclear tests should become a first step in that direction. It will soon be one year since the Soviet Union suspended its testing in the hope that the United States would follow suit.

In addition to that, the Soviet Union advanced a programme of abolishing nuclear weapons by the turn of the century Washington and its NATO allies received concrete proposals from the Warsaw Treaty member-countries concerning the destruction of chemical weapons and deep cuts in conventional armaments.

Compromise proposals related to medium-range missiles and cuts in strategic nuclear weapons were tabled at the Geneva talks.

Officials in Washington and some other capitals of the NATO Countries still think in terms of pre-nuclear times, in categories of forces and military superiority.

In the present-day conditions, no nation, however powerful, or a group of nations can build their own security and prosperity on dictating with the help of military might their will to other countries and peoples.

This policy is destructive. Nowadays, there exists only one battlefield -- the negotiating table, with talks conducted on the principle of equality and equal security. It is only in this field, that it is possible to find a constructive solution to all problems that worry the world.

UN CW RESOLUTION DEPENDENT ON U.S. STAND

LD161745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Political observer Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] The Soviet representative has proposed at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament that the participants of the conference work out and present a draft of a convention on full and general banning of chemical weapons to the next session of the UN General Assembly [UNGA]. Here is the latest news commentary with political observer Vladimir Tsvetov at the microphone:

The scientists calculated that a nuclear weapon being delivered by one strategic bomber is capable of striking the area of 30 square kilometers. If the very same bomber takes on board a chemical weapon it strikes an area of up to 60 square kilometers. This is twice as much. It is clear from this data alone how great the necessity is to completely eliminate chemical weapons. Such a necessity stands out with even more clarity if we take into consideration that the United States intends to start broad production of binary gas, which is an especially dangerous means for mass elimination of people. Calling for a convention on full and general elimination of chemical weapons before the 41st UNGA session, the Soviet Union also tables a proposal on the content of the convention.

This includes: destruction of chemical weapons stockpiles, destruction or dismantling of the installation where such weapons are produced, and last, an effective control over the observance of the convention, including systematic international on-spot inspections.

The Soviet proposals are met with a positive response in many countries, including many NATO countries. At the same session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament where the Soviet representative spoke, the delegate from Great Britain announced his government's efforts to ban chemical weapons. True, this announcement does not quite conform to the British secretary for defense's position when, at the May meeting with his NATO colleagues in Brussels, he approved the American plan for production of binary chemical missiles and bombs. Nonetheless, it is possible to consider the announcement as evidence of Great Britain's anxiety in connection with the dissemination of chemical weapons in Western Europe and in the world.

As far as other American allies are concerned, 6 out of 15 NATO participants spoke out in Brussels against production and siting binary gas ammunition [razmeshcheniye] in Western Europe. They are: The Netherlands, Norway, Denmark , Greece, Luxembourg and Iceland. Their apprehensions in connection with the American chemical plans for Western Europe are natural. In case of chemical war, the losses among civilian population would exceed the losses of the forces 20-30 times. In other words, chemical weapons would turn Western Europe into a double hostage of the United States: nuclear and chemical.

In striving for full and general elimination of chemical weapons, the Soviet Union has done everything for the quickest conclusion to draw up the convention. Now it is the turn of the United States. It is now mainly dependent on the United States, whether or not the UN General Assembly receives the draft of the convention, which is so important and essential for mankind.

COMMENTATOR VIEWS INTERNATIONAL SCIENTISTS FORUM

LD162114 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by Tomas Kolesnichenko, PRAVDA international information editor]

[Text] Hello, comrades! It is said that big things can best be seen at a distance, but it can already be said with certainty that the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban which has been held in Moscow has become an important landmark in the general antiwar movement of our times. I will point out first of all that the participants of the Moscow forum may be said to represent the cream of world science, therefore their voice in defense of peace and a realistic process of disarmament and against the arms race has a particularly authoritative ring to it. Now politicians have got a first hand -- as the saying goes -- objective, profoundly scientific and competent conclusion on the impermissibility of outbreak of nuclear war, for it would destroy human civilization. It is also a fundamentally important fact that the scientists who gathered together from 32 countries unanimously stressed that the first step, or it could also be called the major step, in the struggle against the threat of nuclear catastrophe is cessation of nuclear tests. To speak specifically, they gave a high evaluation of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, and called upon the United States and other nuclear powers to join in it.

There is another remarkable fact, one that emerged very clearly during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and representatives of the Moscow forum. The scientists cited convincing figures from various countries that testify to the wide support for a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Finally, perhaps the most important thing that was demonstrated by the Moscow forum of scientists is that the new way of thinking appropriate to our nuclear-space epoch is increasingly taking hold of people's minds. Doctors, architects, people of diverse professions and political views, and now scientists are uniting their efforts. They understand that in our times one cannot think in the categories of the past, that is, rely on the force of arms and use them to solve world problems.

Now it is up to politicians in the West, and first and foremost the United States. But for the time being we are hearing only their echoes of explosions. It has become known, for instance that the next explosion at the Nevada testing ground has been set for tomorrow, 17 July. Is this not an example of sluggish thinking, falling back on the old doctrine rejected by life itself? The scientists, who set up the seismic equipment in the testing area have once again proved that there are simply no technical grounds for banning nuclear tests. But there is something else, namely the unwillingness of the U.S. leaders to heed the voice of the world public, which is more and more decisively demanding that nuclear tests be halted and that a beginning be made on real disarmament. The Moscow forum of scientists for halting nuclear tests demonstrated this yet again.

ZHOLKVER, AGAYANTS DENOUNCE FRG SDI PARTICIPATION

LD162301 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 16 Jul 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] [Agayants] A Pentagon representative has officially announced the granting of the first order for participation in U.S. military and space programs to a firm in West Germany. I ask our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to talk in greater detail about this.

[Zholkver] To start with I recall that as far back as March a U.S.-West German inter-governmental agreement was signed on the FRG's participation in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative that the Americans themselves frankly call star wars plans. At that time, both in Bonn and Washington, reassurances were made that, as they said, this is purely a formal agreement concerning only theoretical scientific problems. But, as we see, the matter is taking a fully concrete and practical turn. The West German firm has received a Pentagon order for the manufacture of a military satellite, one of many that should be put into service in accordance with the star wars program.

It is worth noting which firm this order has been given to. The Messerschmitt-Blohm firm received the order. This is the same firm that as the older ones among you probably remember, used to supply Hitler's aviation with military planes and reaped enormcus profits from it. It is true that the firm's management is now trying to diminish the significance of the present deal. You see, the matter concerns an order for only $4 million. I will note however that this is by far not the first such order for Messerschmitt -- and clearly not the last. In the past the firm already delivered to the United States a so-called space platform, which was used during the flights of the Challenger shuttle. Now it is reported that after the present Pentagon order others will follow in the near future, this time totalling almost $40 million. So, one can fully understand the current enthusiasm of the bosses at Messerschmitt. The perspectives for new large profits are opening up for them.

[Agayants] In your view, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, what is the advantage for the American side?

[Zholkver] First and foremost, the Pentagon is very worried about the consequences of the catastrophe involving the same Challenger, the flights of which, as with the other American shuttle-type space ships, were, as is known, widely used for military purposes. Now, after the loss of the Challenger and the accidents that followed one another involving the Titan and Delta rockets, the Strategic Defense Initiative, as THE WASHINGTON POST writes, has been thrown backwards and at the present time is generally dead. Thus, to bring life back to plans for star wars preparation, the Pentagon is in a hurry to involve other countries in it, including the FRG, Britain, and Japan. American General Rogers, NATO commander in chief, has recently come out with a special appeal for the creation of a kind of West European branch of the SDI -- a European defense initiative -- of course under the leadership and instruction of the Pentagon. There is another matter in all of this, so to speak, an internal American aspect. It is sufficiently well-known that in recent times more and more Americans, including prominent scientists and congressmen, have been pointing to the extremely dangerous nature of plans to take strike weapons out into space. A draft law has already long been under discussion in Congress that would ban such sinister designs. Now, as THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, even in the Senate the question is being considered of blocking expenditures on the star wars program. And so the Pentagon is hurrying, before these things go through, to quickly hand out its military and space orders and to leave additional loop-holes for their implementation beyond the borders of the United States. I do not think there is a need to say a great deal about how dangerous such plans are for a new and even wider spiral in the arms race.

ARTICLE CALLS FOR 'NEW APPROACH' TO WORLD SECURITY

PM151003 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Kokoshin article: "From Realistic Standpoints: Military-Political Aspects of International Security"]

[Text] One of the most important elements of our party's foreign policy strategy elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress is the concept of creating an all-embracing system of international security.

This concept is the result of a scientifically substantiated, realistic analysis of the present-day system of international relations and the basic trends in its development, in all their multifaceted and contradictory nature. The fact that this concept was put forward is evidence of the new level of our state's economic, political, and defense might and its confidence in its own forces and potential. Through many years of efforts by the Soviet people and our party, a defense potential has been created that, represents a substantial "margin of safety."

The realities of our age are such that the "integration" of the entire structure of international relations and the sharp increase in the interdependence of states have made the world too crowded and vulnerable for wars and strong-arm policies. The physical characteristics of modern weapons and the packed arsenals of the opposing sides are such that no state has a hope of defending itself exclusively by military means, however mighty the defense it creates.

Thus the problem of ensuring international security increasingly becomes a political problem, and the means of resolving it must likewise be political. Therefore security, as the Political Report noted, "if we are talking about USSR-U.S. relations, can only be mutual, and if you take international relations in general, it can only be universal."

The correctness of this conclusion is indicated by the active politicization of many issues that recently were apparently of a purely military or military-political nature. These questions have become the subject of wide debates in circles of the anti-nuclear, antimilitarist movement. [paragraph continues]

They are the subject of bilateral and multilateral talks and dialogues between state and political leaders of different countries.

In present-day conditions an important factor for international security is the military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO. Here the central role belongs to the strategic nuclear arms balance. Parity with the United States in strategic nuclear delivery vehicles was achieved by the Soviet Union by the early seventies, despite all the U.S. efforts to preserve nuclear superiority. In recent years the Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated the ability to maintain the equilibrium achieved, not allowing the United States to secure any significant advantage militarily or politically, whatever means and methods the opposite side may use. Even the tremendous efforts made by U.S. militarist forces in the eighties have been unable to achieve anything. They have only increased international tension and reinforced the trend toward a reduction in strategic stability.

Special concern is caused by the fact that the present level of the balance of nuclear potentials is excessively high. The equal level of danger it ensures for each side cannot forever remain the basis of peace on earth. The preservation of this situation is having an increasingly grave effect on the sociopsychological condition and morality of world civilization. The continuation of the arms race will inevitably increase the weight on the human psyche and lead to an increase in the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. This means that even if the military-strategic equilibrium is preserved, as a result of new, ever more complex rounds in the arms race, its stability will inevitably fall -- to such an extent that even parity will cease to be a factor for military-political deterrence.

The stockpiling and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons is capable of increasing the hypothetical capacity for a disabling strike against the enemy. The addition of ABM and space arms to the existing offensive systems would greatly increase the reactionary imperialist forces' hopes of engaging in aggression with impunity, and would thus further increase the threat of nuclear war. The stability of the military-strategic equilibrium is also reduced by the onset of a new stage in the development of conventional armed forces and armaments, since systems are emerging whose operation is comparable with that of weapons of mass destruction. Moreover the greatly increased range of conventional weapons will make it possible at once to engage in active combat operations not only the border regions, but the territories of the countries concerned, which was not the case in past wars.

All these dangerous trends require the adoption of urgent, radical measures. The Soviet Union proposes that the level of military confrontation be lowered considerably. Equal security should be guaranteed not by an extremely high level, but by an extremely low level of military-strategic equilibrium, taking into account not only quantitative, but also qualitative factors, including geostrategic factors, in the military balance. An important component of the concept of an all-embracing system of international security is the USSR's proposals on ridding the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. In general, this concept covers a wide range of military, political, and also economic and humanitarian aspects of the problem, including sociopsychological factors.

If we regard the military-political sphere as the core of the security problem, here the USSR proposes, alongside the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons and the renunciation of the creation of other means of mass destruction and the militarization of space. There should be a strictly verified decrease of the levels of military potentials down to the limits of reasonable sufficiency, as well as a proportionate and commensurate reduction in military budgets. Great significance would be attached to the renunciation by the nuclear powers of war against each other or against third states -- either nuclear or conventional war.

The military-political aspect of the all-embracing system of international security also presupposes the elaboration of a package of measures aimed at strengthening confidence between states and creating effective guarantees against an attack on them from outside.

A substantial contribution to increasing military-political stability would be to ensure, on a permanent basis, the just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts, and also to elaborate effective measures to cut short international terrorism.

Since the 27th CPSU Congress the Soviet concept of an all-embracing system of international security has been further developed in a number of concrete initiatives. The USSR's proposal to reach an agreement on a significant reduction in all components of ground forces and tactical aircraft of the European states, as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces stationed in Europe, over all the European territory from the Atlantic to the Urals, was received with great interest, especially in Europe. Simultaneously, along with conventional arms, there would also be a reduction in operational-tactical nuclear arms. In combination with the proposal for the USSR and the United States to take on a commitment not to create or to produce new types of conventional arms with comparable destruction potential to weapons of mass destruction, as well as with a number of other initiatives of the Warsaw Pact countries, this opens up new prospects for a radical change for the improvement in the situation in the sphere of conventional armed forces and armaments. Another act in the direction of implementing the concept of security was the decision to extend the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions to 6 August 1986. The Soviet Union once again calls insistently on the American leaders to agree to a ban on nuclear tests.

The position of the present state leadership of the United States and a number of other leading capitalist states is characterized by a reluctance to face up to the realities of the modern world and accept the new philosophy of international security. Many Western mass information organs are making active efforts to minimize the significance of the concept of mutual and general security put forward by the Soviet Union. At the same time it meets with understanding and sympathy in the most diverse public, political, and scientific circles of the West. And there are many politicians who, although they hold ideological and social class positions different from ours, understand that the task of survival requires means and methods radically different from those demanded by a number of governments in power in Western countries and right-wing groups. In particular, there was profound interest in the proposal put forward by our country on reducing states' military arsenals to within the limits of a reasonable sufficiency in the foreseeable future. Submitting this principle fit in with the so-called alternative ideas of security that have recently been circulating widely in the West, ideas that are counterposed to the plans for the buildup of nuclear and conventional arms, "star wars," and so forth. Concepts like these, which envisage the renunciation of nuclear weapons, the prevention of an arms race in space, and radical quantitative and qualitative changes in conventional armed forces and armaments, have become widespread, for instance, in opposition political circles in Britain and the FRG, also in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway.

The introduction of a new approach to international security is a prolonged and complex process, and in many respects a painful one. It requires an active struggle by all peace-loving and realistically minded forces and the revision of many dogmas and stereotypes that have grown up over decades and even centuries. But this is the only way to survive in the conditions of the growing interdependence of modern civilization and to ensure normal conditions for the functioning of the international community.

ACADEMICIAN VIEWS NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ISSUES

PM160905 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Academician V.I. Goldanskiy by A. Ivanko: "The Scientists' Sacred Duty"]

[Text] The struggle for nuclear disarmament and a nuclear test ban is gathering momentum. These questions top the agendas of many international conferences held by public organizations, scientists, and cultural figures. Lenin Prize Winner Academician V.I. Goldanskiy, member of the Soviet Pugwash Committee, attended the international Pugwash meeting which ended in Geneva recently. Our conversation began with the question as to what role scientists and cultural figures can play in the struggle for nuclear disarmament.

[Goldanskiy] Over the past few days I have been acquainting myself attentively with the delegates' speeches at the recent USSR Writers Union congress where many speakers dwelt on the role of science in the modern world. As a rule, criticism was being voiced. This has left me with mixed feelings. On one hand, not all the reproaches leveled at scientists were just, on the other hand, it is pleasing to see genuine concern for the fate of mankind, for the fate of the country. You begin to better understand what a great weight science carries in modern society and how great the belief is that science can cause untold harm, or vice versa, deliver mankind from it.

Today mankind is living under the threat of nuclear war that hangs over it like the sword of Damocles. Scientists' most sacred duty is to avert this danger. The main means for achieving this is nuclear disarmament. The danger of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war is also becoming more real with every passing year. The Pugwash movement participants have noted more than once that this scenario for war breaking out is quite probable. Events such as the Challenger catastrophe and the accident at the Chernobyl AES which bear out that there is no fail-safe guarantee for technical safety in conditions of advanced computerization have played a great role in making people realize this danger. It would be useful to organize international scientific research on the lines of the research carried out into the "nuclear winter," research that would include quantitative assessments of the probability of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war and of the rate at which this probability increases in proportion with the buildup of arms and their increasing sophistication.

[Ivanko] "Nuclear winter," "accidental nuclear war" -- after all, the future of mankind is behind these terms. Will mankind survive in the event of a catastrophe?

[Goldanskiy] I looked into this problem, in particular when I studied the origins of life from the viewpoint of physics, comparing the capacity of biological systems for self-reproduction with the optical properties characteristic of the basic "molecules of life" -- nucleic acids and proteins. An analysis of all the known data about the origins of life indicates that in the prebiological, inanimate world, the preconditions for life arose not through gradual evolution but through a kind of jump, a phase transition, rather like water changing into ice at a certain temperature. Thus, formal analysis leads to the conclusion that mankind can by its own doing introduce such powerful additional factors into the conditions prevailing on the earth today that it will not just annihilate civilization but will also completely destroy the biosphere in general and return the earth to the conditions that prevailed when there was no life. That is a phase transition in reverse only this time effected by man himself.

It cannot be denied that scientists have had a direct part in bringing about this state of affairs; the genie has been let out of the bottle, and therefore they are obliged to do their utmost in order to get it back in.

[Ivanko] Everyone understands that a nuclear catastrophe must be prevented. How can this be done, by what method? Where in your view, should we begin?

[Goldanskiy] Without any doubt, a complete and general ban on nuclear tests would be the most effective first step. As is known, in 1963 a treaty was concluded banning nuclear weapons tests in three media -- the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. Had all nuclear tests been banned then, the present-day world would be a world without cruise missiles, multiple nuclear warheads, and neutron weapons. The tests that are currently being carried out will provide the basis for the creation of new generations of nuclear weapons, including "star wars" weapons -- nuclear-excited X-ray lasers, for instance. Without nuclear tests it will not be possible to improve existing nuclear weapons or to create new ones.

You often hear: At one time the problem of verification [kontrol] was cited as the main obstacle in the path of the conclusion of a general nuclear test ban treaty.

Now the technical means are much more sophisticated than they were in 1963. According to the view of most scientists they make it possible to register even very low-yield tests and to reliably distinguish them from earthquakes. The Obninsk seismic observatory, for instance, registered the U.S. explosion codenamed "Mighty Oak" on 10 April whose yield was a mere 1.3 kilotons.

Most people throughout the world, but above all scientists in all countries, including the United States, favor a ban on nuclear tests. It is no accident that U.S. scientist and Nobel Prize winner Glenn Seaborg -- the man who discovered plutonium and who for some 10 years chaired the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission -- is one of the initiators of the nuclear test ban movement. Scientists the world over agree -- the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has met with their full support.

In conclusion I would like to appeal to all scientists, cultural workers, and writers. We can and must play a major role in the struggle for nuclear disarmament. I recall U.S. director Stanley Kramer's movie "On the Beach" which depicted mankind's destruction through nuclear war. It ends with the following shot -- in an empty, lifeless street a banner is fluttering with the inscription: "There is still time, brother." Let us not waste time while we still have it.

COMPARISON OF CHERNYSHEV COMMENTARY ON MBFR TALKS

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVESZDA in Russian on 5 July carries in its second edition on page 5 a report on the commentary by military observer V. Chernyshev. The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA report, entitled "Vienna Barriers and the Straight Road," has been compared with the TASS English version published in the 7 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page AA 5, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph one, line two in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reads: the European Continent. Official Washington now tries to mislead the public, to shift the (inserting "official" and subbing "public" for "world";

Paragraph two, lines six and seven in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA read: too, it is once again the Western participants in (inserting "once again the");

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA omits the entire third paragraph;

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA also omits the last two lines on page AA 5 and the entire first paragraph on page AA 6.

'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS

OW151101 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0708 GMT 15 Jul 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Egon Bahr, member of the Presidium of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG; David Owen, leader of the British Social Democratic Party and former UK foreign minister; Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the Institute of the United States of America and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of APN -- Bahr and Owen speak in English with superimposed Russian translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades, we are coming to you from Studio 9 of the Ostankino television center for our regular television talk devoted to topical problems of world politics. I will begin by introducing the participants in our discussion today: Egon Bahr, member of the Presidium of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG; David Owen, leader of the British Social Democratic Party and former UK foreign minister; Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the Institute of the United States of America and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences: and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of APN.

Mr Owen and Mr Bahr are in Moscow in connection with meetings of the working group of the Palme Commission. This international commission was established in 1980 by a group of prominent state and public officials of various contries and was headed until his recent tragic death, by Olof Palme, prime minister of Sweden. It has won great international prestige. The commission includes people of various political views and orientations, but they are all united by the idea of the need of creating a world secure for all. This activity of the commission has created for itself great international prestige.

The extensive report published 4 years ago by the commission was simply called: Security for All. It evoked great interest throughout the world and great support in the most diverse circles of the international public. The commission is continuing its work and I would like to begin our discussion today with a question to you, Mr Bahr. I know that the commission's meetings are confidential, but excuse my professional curiosity. I nevertheless would like to ask you, what can you tell us about the meetings that have just been held in Moscow?

[Bahr] This was a preparatory meeting at which we laid a basis for a new meeting in Budapest in late October, and we will concentrate on questions of European security. I think that we have prepared our documents on problems of European security successfully. This was our intention and we fulfilled it.

[Zorin] To start, I would like to ask you how do you members of the Palme Commission view European security? Mr Owen.

[Owen] There are different views on this question, but there is a common approach to the fact that we are at a watershed in terms of the arms race and disarmament. Either we go to substantial and important agreements, mainly between the Soviet Union and the United States, or we will arrive at no agreements at all and the entire decade of the 80's will be one of an increasing arms race and years of deteriorating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. None of us wants this to happen. Personally, I am fairly optimistic. I think that a summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev will take place in Washington in December. I do not think that they will lead to very far-reaching agreements, but it seems that some limited results will be achieved.

Now the next major summit meeting in Moscow next year will, I hope, bring about a truly practical reduction in strategic nuclear arms.

[Zorin] Would you like to add something?

[Arbatov] Yes, I would like to add something. David Owen has used the world watershed. This really is the case. One can look at the situation today in different ways. It is like a large menu of events from which various dishes can be selected, and depending on the selection you get either a sour, a sweet and sour, or a sweet taste in your mouth. The situation at present really is like this. On the one hand, the threat is growing, the arms race is intensifying, and the regime of even modest agreements which were concluded with such difficulty and after such hard work during the 70's is falling apart. Tension is growing, regional conflicts are continuing and even exacerbating, and everything points the other way.

At the same time, we can see another side of the picture. The understanding, the clear understanding that this situation is intolerable, is unprecedentedly great. I think that never before have so many people on earth understood to such an extent just how senseless nuclear war and the nuclear arms race are. People are coming to this conclusion, and I think that recent years have provided a number of good lessons in this sphere.

This creates a need for actions and opportunities for actions -- a need because of the threats and an opportunity because there is already a platform of sorts, various points of view, and public opinion which puts pressure on governments and makes this possible. But this relates primarily to Europe where, in general, detente has not died. We discussed this favorable issue, and I hope that in October the plenary session of the Commission in Budapest will do something about this, will make its contribution, although of course it is impossible for the Commission or any other group of people to shoulder such a burden of responsibility. It will require the efforts of everybody -- sober-minded political parties, politicians, governments, and the public of Europe.

[Falin] I would like to add one thing, if I may. It seems to me that it would not be quite accurate to simply say that there were agreements and limited agreements. The main thing was that in the seventies a mechanism was worked out...

[Arbatov interrupts] Of an infrastructure.

[Falin] of a certain infrastructure, and the most valuable thing was that principles were agreed upon. Everything undertaken at the time was not viewed as an isolated independent act but as a system of action, a process. That is why SALT I was to be followed by SALT II, SALT II by SALT III, and so forth. Of course we can always begin from the start, from the beginning, from a coordination of principles...

[Arbatov interrupts] Well Valentin Mikhaylovich, you know they say that hope makes a good breakfast but not much of a dinner.

[Falin] That is true, but on the other hand we cannot lose those important acquisitions [Falin says a few words but no audio is carried] that were made at the time. Essentially it was decided in the seventies that there cannot be two securities, particularly in Europe. There can be only one security, one that is equal for both Western and Eastern Europe.

[Zorin] It seems to me that one of the fatal problems today -- I do not know if you will agree with me, but I think it is so -- lies in the fact that the tasks facing mankind today often do not correspond with the approach of extremely influential circles to the solution of these tasks. A kind of gulf, a division exists. What would you say about this, Mr Owen?

[Owen] Approaches really do differ, there is no doubt about this. One of the problems at the talks on limiting the arms race lies in the fact that the composition of arsenals is extremely varied. A trend toward building large land-based missiles with powerful warheads predominates in the Soviet Union, while the United States prefers to concentrate on submarines with missiles in order to achieve more strike accuracy without installing such powerful warheads.

In striving for mutually acceptable agreements these differences must be taken into account. Ultimately, agreements on limiting arms will not be worth the paper they are written on if each side does not feel every day that as a result of the agreement its security has strengthened and not lessened. In many ways I agree with what you have said about an infrastructure that was established in the seventies. I think that the agreement on reducing antimissile defenses signed in 1972 is extremely important, and we must ensure that in the next year or so it is not frustrated. President Reagan did not like the SALT II agreement which he inherited from President Carter. Until recently he did not exceed the boundaries of the limitations stipulated by the agreement, and I think that he can agree to adhere to the agreement in future, although the President has made a statement -- in incorrect one I think -- that he will break the agreement.

I do not agree with this. It is better not to revoke SALT II but to instead replace it with a new agreement on limiting strategic arms. But ideas really do differ, and various views exist. For example the United States accuses the USSR of violating certain provisions of the agreement while the Soviet Union accuses the United States of the same thing. We cannot appoint some kind of referee here like we do in football who could make a decision as to what is a violation and what is not. Both sides must come to an agreement.

I think that after General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan's meeting in Geneva, the world breathed a sigh of relief. Remember the fireside chat. What is the problem today? As far as I can understand it, in General Secretary Gorbachev's opinion, he sees no great purpose in going to Washington if the talks there do not lead to substantial results, and I sympathize with this point of view. I think that the world also does not want another meeting devoted to a discussion of general topics. It awaits progress.

What do we have a right to expect by the end of this year? We expect that by the end of the year the entire process of talks and agreements will once again be set back on track. Not a single important agreement has been included since 1979. This is a long time.

[Zorin] Mr Owen, you have spoken about two approaches. Naturally two great powers cannot have one approach. I had in mind that in our nuclear age, stereotypes of pre-nuclear age thinking are not applicable. But we often collide with old stereotypes in this nuclear age. This is what I had in mind when I asked this question.

[Owen] I see, then I did not understand the question. I agree with you. Before the appearance of nuclear weapons, we thought about wars which could be won or lost. But after nuclear weapons appeared, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world came to realize that it had entered a period of a completely different type of war, wars in which there would be no victors. In the seventies and the beginning of the eighties there was a trend when the military on both sides and maybe especially on the Western side, started to discuss openly the possibility of winning the war. One of the results of the Palme Commission's work was the conclusion that there could be no victors in a nuclear war.

Both Gorbachev and Reagan came to the same conclusion at their meeting. And if everything settles down in its place and if all agree with the idea that there can be no victors in a nuclear war, then it follows that no such war should occur, and for this reason we should reduce nuclear armaments and create a climate for confidence so as to finally, and this may require a long time, completely get rid of them.

[Bahr] Allow me to make some additional remarks on this. This situation is fairly simple. Either we shall live in security together, or we shall die together. It is as simple as that. So the security we must strive for will not, I think, require changes in this or that society. Why do some prefer coffee and others tea? The main thing is to live in security.

So this would mean that we, striving for security, shall not demand that the other side change its social system. When your general secretary came to Geneva, it was not expected that he would praise the qualities of capitalism. Nor the other way around -- Reagan did not become a communist fellow-traveler by going to Geneva. The only thing mankind has the right to demand from the two great powers is that they ensure security. And for this there is a real need for new thinking. Because even after the two powers managed to work out important agreed-upon formulas in Geneva, we did not see them put into practice.

How can the words of agreements be turned into reality? For this purpose there is a need for a real change in policy. I cannot say that the Soviet Union has substantially changed its policy in this direction. I would like to see the West, instead of further testing new weapons, trying to test General Secretary Gorbachev about whether he will act in accordance with what he promised and said. That is all.

[Arbatov] I would like to add to this. You know, I think that it is fine that they admitted that it is not possible to wage a nuclear war and that it is not possible to win it. That amounts to admitting that it is better to live than die. And without any hints, Egon, when a man is told that he must stop smoking in order to live, he does not always do that but continues to smoke. And here is the kind of picture we see in politics -- there is hardly anyone, I think, apart from some madmen, who thinks that there are people who deliberately have a plan in their safes for pressing a button at a given hour to begin a nuclear war.

It is important to take another step in the new thinking of the nuclear age, to understand that many forms of normal political behavior are now prohibited. They have become luxuries which we can no longer afford, like the arms race, the absence of a dialogue, regional conflicts which grow for years with no one undertaking any serious measures to liquidate them because of possible involvement in a war. That has happened in history more than once, completely against our will.

The main problem now is that the Geneva accord has been signed, and everybody knows that it is not possible to wage a nuclear war and to win it. But conclusions must be drawn from this and time is passing; it is working against us. It becomes more and more difficult to come to an agreement. Conclusions about our daily behavior must be made. We must have a firm guarantee for this.

[Falin] Allow me to add this. It is necessary to keep in mind that not only political declarations have an influence on military strategy and military construction. Military construction and especially the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapons systems has an influence on policy, political concepts about the other side, on all the political and other processes happening in the world. So for the declarations, however indisputable they are, to play a real role in consolidating peace and creating a firm and stable climate in the world, they must be followed by material and very precise steps. What Mr Owen has already said and what is included in the Salt I and Salt II treaties is extremely important, that is. outlining measures which are necessary in the military field not on the basis of national notions on security but on general notions of security. If each of the sides begins to build its military policy on the basis of how it understands its own security and the organization of security for others, then there can and there will be no agreement at all.

Now we have to take another step which we proposed at our last congress, to declare and establish as the basis of all our actions that today there are no problems, including the problem of security, that can be solved by military means. For this there is only one way -- political means, political agreements, the negotiation table.

[Zorin] I think that the new proposals concerning security in Europe outlined recently by the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest bear a direct relation to the topic of our discussion. Mr Owen, what is your evaluation of these proposals? Do they, in your opinion, create a real possibility for improving European security?

[Owen] Yes, but I think that it is the first step. We have been holding talks in Vienna for 15 years. The issue concerns achieving reductions in central Europe. and I think that we are very close to agreement. Before we move to a much broader approach envisaged in the Warsaw Pact countries' proposals, I think we should achieve an agreement at the first stage in Vienna. After all, it will include an agreement on verification and inspection which would give both sides the confidence that the other is not violating the agreement.

We must be frank in this. The problem with these agreements is that up to now there has not been sufficient confidence in relations between states, and for this reason we must create very firm and reliable means and procedures for verification which would make it possible for each side to be sure that the other side is not deceiving it. And if we reach agreement in Vienna, I think this will open the way toward much broader talks which will include a larger number of weapons systems and cover larger territories from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Personally, I think that it is very important to hold direct discussions between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. It is time for them, instead of coninuing to plan military actions against each other, to begin a dialogue with each other on the question of limiting the arms race and disarmament, which would cover conventional armaments as well as tactical nuclear weapons which though less powerful and with a more dangerous and may provoke a war more quickly.

[Zorin] You would like to say something?

[Bahr] I could subscribe to every word said by my friend David Owen. But I would like to go back for a second to the general situation. I think that since Gorbachev in January this year offered his program for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons, we have demanded that this program be supplemented with a section on conventional armaments. We said that if the significance or the value of nuclear weapons is reduced, then consequently the significance of conventional armaments increases.

Now we have a whole package of Soviet proposals. I have to say that expanding the territory which is under discussion, -- at present it is from the Atlantic to the Urals -- also produced great satisfaction in the West. This was also demanded by Western Europe.

I also have to say that representing a country which does not possess nuclear weapons, I think our influence at the talks on these weapons between the two great powers is fairly limited. But we are interested in them and we have certain influence in issues relating to conventional armaments. We stick to the old position concerning nuclear weapons. We would like to get rid of them.

But now we are entering a stage in which Europe can play a special role and may even take a leading role in these talks. I also agree with David Owen in that these talks should be more focused on the real armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact in Europe.

Of course we should not neglect the other regions. The main problem is the central European region. It will have to be solved by way of creation of a relatively balanced situation between the two sides. We should not overlook the real danger, which is precisely in the central region. Therefore we shall have to combine the solution of central European problems with the problems concerning the whole of Europe.

[Arbatov] You see, that is correct. But I think that if we cross the bridge of the Vienna talks and think in that context about the proposals made by the Warsaw Pact, we unfortunately see that after 13 [as reads] years of talks in Vienna, the agreement is ready, it was ready long ago but has not been concluded, and if concluded it will only deal -- and this was said at our session -- with less than one percent of the armed forces. Therefore I think that these proposals are not just an expansion of the geographic region but also an impetus for new thinking, a new approach to the problems of security in central Europe, and that it is necessary to think on a considerably larger and more serious scale, and much more quickly, of course.

[Falin] The last question is somewhat more complex. When Mr. Egon Bahr says that the FRG is not a nuclear power, but that is conditional. The proliferation of nuclear weapons does not signify the emergence of new states possessing this type of weapons. Proliferation is also deployment of these nuclear weapons on foreign territory.

With respect to concentration of nuclear potential and nuclear weapons on FRG territory, you have to search for another regions in the world where there is a greater quantity of these weapons.

So the issue of the place of the FRG in the nuclear counterbalance is a debatable one. This does not diminish but on the contrary emphasizes the importance of the proposals that have been made, which expand our previous proposals. I shall remind you that some time ago, the Warsaw Pact countries offered to sign an agreement on the first use of nuclear and nonnuclear weapons in the zone of action of the final Helsinki act.

And now we offer a considerable, substantial, 25 or more percent reduction in armaments and armed forces, and the removal, from the regions where these reductions will take place, of not only separate units but combined forces in order to establish a balance of forces in Europe and thus establish a corresponding balance of forces in the world in many aspects.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, speaking in connection with President Mitterrand's visit, said that the Soviet side is ready, if we have a surplus in some aspects compared with NATO countries, to get rid of this surplus. We surmise that the same will done by our Western partners. That will be a real balance, a reduction which will not damage the security of any side. We have not sought nor do we seek superiority. And you must start from this main premise in order to understand how sincere and how substantial our proposals are.

[Bahr] Could I make some remarks concerning what Valentin Falin has said? First of all, I find simply tragic the situation we have witnessed. If the USSR had made its current proposals concerning nuclear weapons let us say 5 years ago, my country and other West European countries would never have had cruise or Pershing missiles. That is a regrettable fact. I would like to say explicitly that the new Soviet position came late, but it really is an excellent position for beginning real talks. We are in a time of most responsible decisions.

There is another fact. What Gorbachev said during Mitterrand's visit to Moscow is actually very interesting and opens additional possibilities for discussion, talks. The matter is that we think that the Warsaw Pact has a certain superiority in conventional armaments. Gorbachev has said that he was ready to reduce this superiority to a level ensuring an approximate balance. Of course that includes the other side. If the West is quantitatively superior in some respect, it will also have to undertake reductions. That is really a good proposal, and I fully agree with it.

[Zorin] I would only say that what comes too late cannot be corrected.

[Arbatov] No, that is not the point. I think that memory is failing here somewhat. Although Egon has an excellent memory, it is failing him a little. Five years ago, in June 1981, we had no talks at all with the United States, no dealings at all.

[Falin interrupts] You mean 7 years ago. Egon has 7 years ago in mind.

[Arbatov] Yes. And this issue could not have been raised anywhere. The United States started from a very different premise.

[Bahr] Let us say 1982.

[Arbatov] I am sure that in 1982 some would have been found, as it has been found now, to reject the Soviet proposal. A way would have been found then. Arguing is the most fruitless thing. History does not accept any subjunctive mood. We cannot approach things this way.

[Owen] It was caused by the deployment of Soviet SS-20 missiles in the seventies -- in the years 1977 and 1978. But I think more interesting is the question of why the United States needs nuclear weapons in Europe. The Soviet Union always found it difficult to understand that after 1945 some of our security was assured by the fact that the United States remained in Europe.

If the United States had removed its land-based missiles from Europe, you would have had to dismantle your land-based missiles over a large territory up to the Urals. We reached agreement on this issue.

The position of the USSR has been more accepting of the fact that France will keep nuclear weapons and Britain will also have nuclear weapons. They are small nuclear forces with minimal potential to deter. But their presence means that if the United States removes its land-based missiles, there will still be a certain number of missiles in Europe, which by no means are a counterbalance for Soviet weapons.

Nevertheless, they amount to a certain potential to deter and that means that there is a European element in it along with the Soviet one. We are more tolerant of the fact that you have a need for missiles in the Asiatic part of the USSR.

All these are changes which have occurred during the past year. We now have a better understanding of your concern with respect to Asia, whereas you understand the position of France and Britain and their concern about the possibility of complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe. I think we shall reach agreement. It is possible that the agreement will not provide for the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. and Soviet missiles. This can be achieved in two stages. However, the present proposal is of great significance, and at first it provides for the removal of Pershing-2 missiles, leaving behind a small number of SS-20 and cruise missiles, and then in the second stage, completely reducing all the missiles.

If we agree with what Egon has pointed out and proceed with the reduction of missiles and nuclear warheads, we shall have to pay special attention to being certain about conventional armaments, so that no one can gain superiority in this respect. That lets me be more optimistic, if only we manage to convince political leaders and especially President Reagan to finally decide to hold talks. I do not think that we shall know about that before November or December this year. By that time it will become known whether President Reagan is ready to cross over the watershed and enter the age of arms limitations.

We would have never thought this possible with President Nixon. But he and President Brezhnev crossed this threshold in 1971, and I hope that the leaders will cross this threshold in 1986 and 1987.

[Arbatov] Nixon did not have Perle, or Weinberger, or many others.

[Owen] You all thought that Nixon and Kissinger were hawks before those agreements were signed. At that time, at the beginning of the seventies, the Vietnam war was in full swing and yet they arrived at an agreement. When Nixon came to power, hardly anyone could have thought that he would be the first president to sign a most important agreement on arms limitations with the USSR. I think that we cannot exclude the same possibility for President Reagan. President Reagan has the advantage that if he signs an agreement with the Soviet Union, he will manage to push it through Congress and achieve ratification. And that is one of the problems. The last 3 agreements have not been ratified by Congress.

[Arbatov] Frankly, I envy your optimism David, and would like to be infected with it. However, I recall that Nixon took some steps toward change in the first 2 years of his presidency, while Reagan has only 2 years left. Time is running out, and I would have liked to see some changes here, yet we must be realists even if we are optimists.

I would like to stress the other side, the fact -- that is what I thought came out of what Mr Owen said -- that everything depends on statesmen. Everything depends on the collection of ideas with which they come to power, the ideas they have about the other side and the requirements of the world; the ideas that arise in them in the process of realizing their power; and, naturally, what they want to do in practice and not simply say.

If we take the point of view expressed by Mr Owen, then I am prepared to agree. Where there is a will, the problems that face us today and determine the face of world today and tomorrow -- that is very important -- can be solved in a very short period of time -- in several rounds of talks.

[Arbatov interrupts] Not only can be, but possibly should be...

[Falin interrupts] It should be, that is another question...

[Arbatov interrupts] Because if it is delayed...

[Falin interrupts] Not only should it be, it can be.

[Arbatov] It cannot be delayed. Yes.

[Falin] Herein lies the essence. Mr Bahr knows how many decades the problems of West Berlin was mulled over and how much time was needed to solve this problem.

[Arbatov] What about the example of the partial nuclear test ban treaty? Two weeks -- even in the absence of the infrastructure about which you have spoken.

[Zorin] Now I would like us to touch on several problems. Therefore, I want to ask a question on a different topic. I would like to ask you, Mr Bahr, about your attitude toward Washington's doctrine of neoglobalism. Its application can be seen, for example, in relation to Nicaragua, Libya, Greanda. Are you not fearful that Washington can extend this doctrine to Europe?

[Bahr] This is a wonderful question. [laughs] First of all, let me start by saying that I did not come to Moscow to condemn our biggest ally. Having said this, I would like to note that during my visit to Washington 2 weeks ago I did not find a new doctrine there, but discovered that a struggle was underway between those that are called multilateralists. The latter consider that insofar as negotiations have not yielded any results for so long and insofar as during this time the arms buildup has occurred much faster than negotiations on their limitation, and since the problem of verification has become increasingly more difficult, let us stop this nonsense and stop trying to achieve agreement.

Instead, they say, let us rely on something like mutual restraint, tacitly or openly. Then negotiations and even summit meetings can also be used, but in order to achieve understanding of how both sides would behave. This is that I think unilaterialism is. I think it is directly contrary to the principle of common security, security for all, and I think that it will be very dangerous if this approach becomes doctrine in the United States. This has not occurred yet, but the struggle continues.

[Falin] Of course, it is very pleasing to hear what Egon Bahr has said -- that the struggle is still underway. But this struggle has several points and factors that we must take into consideration -- and this is the fact that this struggle is not occurring for the first time. After 1945 this struggle ended with the well-known position, which Baruch formulated as follows: It is of no consequence that we are not right -- it is important that we are strong.

I am not too sure that this struggle is in a process of ripening and that it is not already being reflected in certain military doctrines. For example, the United States' latest naval doctrine, published in January this year, contains the thesis that the United States is pursuing a policy of balancing on the brink of war on a global scale. This is recorded in a document. If this is so, and if this is maintained by the U.S. Navy chief of staff, then this is more than a discussion: It is a definite line of behavior and a definite direction of military construction. We should not regard this too frivolously.

Finally, we have spoken about Europe's position in these neoglobalist concepts of the United States and wondered if there are not certain dangers in connection with them. Now, we know from postwar U.S. doctrines that Europe is viewed as a line of forward defense. The question of forward defense or not forward defense is not simply a geographic concept -- it is not just a line along which troops are deployed. Forward defense is also a concept of anticipation, a concept of preventive strikes. As we can read in a number of U.S. documents of a certain period, which have now been declassified, this means the adoption of measures. They say that their advantages should be brought into play when the potential enemy still has no means for combatting these advantages. This too means a forward defense.

Therefore, this question is fairly complicated and has several cross sections -- it can be viewed both in the vertical and horizontal -- and there is no simple answer to it. In any case, everyone in Moscow would only applaud if the supporters of the creation of security on the basis of cooperation would take the upper hand in Washington.

[Owen] We could exchange documents both sides have in their possession. I could cite statements of Soviet admirals about building up the might and activities of the Soviet fleet throughout the world. I can show documents about Soviet military planning which create the impression there are plans for the use of nuclear weapons. But I do not think we will get very far with this. There are a variety of reasons for this. After all, the military on both sides are engaged in their military business. The position of the political leadership on the question of our relations is far more important.

I think that if we speak about Europe, then these relations are to a certain extent predetermined. We may not like the division of Europe that occurred as a result of war, but in the broad sense of the word this fact has been accepted. We know what limitations exist and our attitude to events such as those that occured in their time in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland is determined precisely by this.

A problem arises in other cases, like with Nicaragua, for example, a country the United States considers to fall within its sphere of interests. On this basis, the United States is pursuing a policy which is criticized by many, not only in the Soviet Union, but in the Third World and in other countries as well. In exactly the same way, you consider Afghanistan in your sphere of interest. Not only we, not only the West, but many other countries of the Third World believe that you have interfered in the affairs of Afghanistan. I believe that both the United States and the Soviet Union should admit that now a third voice can be heard in international affairs -- the voice of the nonaligned states.

And I do not think that the Third World, particularly the nonaligned world, will accept in the future this doctrine of spheres of influence extending directly beyond the traditionally and historically formed zones of the dominant influence of the United States or the Soviet Union. Therefore, I think a preiod of limitation of the superpowers will begin.

[Arbatov] That was the Sonnenfeldt doctrine.

[Owen] What?

[Arbatov] It was just the Sonnenfeldt doctrine. We never shared this view on division into spheres of influence. Never mind, go on please. [last three words spoken in English]

[Owen] You do it! For many years you have been interfering in the affairs of Afghanistan.

[Falin interrupts] This is another question.

[Owen] But you decided that you must defend your positions and you have used and continue to use Soviet troops in Afghanistan. The United States has adopted a similar position -- I do not share it -- that it has special interests in Nicaragua, and it is using its influence for destabilization, reckoning that thereby it is defending its interests as it perceives them there.

I believe that we must be very careful with this expansion of influence and this term sphere of influence. It should be forgotten. I agree that it has various meanings, but what is topical now is limitation of the influence of the superpowers beyond the boundaries of certain areas. In its policies or in its relations with the GDR, Hungary, and other countries, the European Community is elaborating a somewhat different position, a European position. It is taking shape slowly but the process is underway and in my opinion the world is becoming a more interesting place owing to it; and if Europe moves toward unity, it will have a very serious influence.

I do not think that the world will continue to be divided up where the role of the superpowers will be played by the United States and the Soviet Union. Both of these powers are finding that their influence is limited. And I welcome that [last sentence not translated into Russian]

[Arbatov] Yes, I think that we have no doubts over what you said last, that we are not omnipotent, we have no imperial plans. Generally we understand full well, it seems to me, and this follows from all of our doctrine, which has been clearly expressed of late, in particular in all out doctrines, for example in the doctrine on security, universal security -- I am referring to documents of our congress.

But I would primarily like to comment on what you have said, David. You know, if you speak about our country, what we are talking about is related precisely to the struggle to overcome old thinking. You understand that occasionally one can look at the areas adjacent to the border [prigranichyy rayon] -- this is natural and every country does this -- as an area of particular sensitivity, precisely out of considerations of security and particularly by a country that has suffered a lot and that has often seen this security threatened. The more we proceed toward this security for all and the more the fear of a threat decreases, the less a role such considerations will play.

And what happens in the United States and what Egon spoke about, that unilateralism -- I do not know how to translate it into Russian -- it is rather a kind of attribution to oneself of the right to act in the international arena proceeding exclusively from one's own interests and perceptions of one's interests without considering those of others.

In America it acquires a different character. So far it has been done fairly carefully and I could even say in a cowardly manner. So far the objectives were countries where the United States was not threatened with a loss of more than several dozen victims. That includes Grenada, Libya, Nicaragua, where mostly mercenaries have been used...

[Falin interrputs] In Lebanon.

[Arbatov] Yes. But further, well, Lebanon was precisely an example of this. When over 200 U.S. Marines perished, the Americans withdrew. The Vietnam syndrome is still present in the United States, and in America they fear a repetition of that situation.

But what is developing now worries me and I have understood that it also worries you. What has now begun in the form of an electoral doctrine with respect to three or four objectives is already acquiring a doctrinaire of conceptual form as a general political platform with respect to the entire surrounding world -- that you can do anything you like, anything you consider to be in your interests without considering others. And this is completely contrary to the concept of security for all to which this unilateralism is an antipode just like neoglobalism is the antipode of peaceful coexistence. It is taking the right to change the internal systems of countries where the systems do not suit you.

[Falin] Here there is another substantial point. First, the theory attributed to us of wanting to have a sphere of influence is wrong in its foundations. We do not want to have spheres of influence, we want to maintain normal and good relations with all countries and first of all, of course, with our neighbors.

Second, our aid to Afghanistan began in 1978, and armed aid in 1979, while armed intervention organized by the Americans in Afghanistan's affairs started in 1976 -- if you want to be precise and proceed from facts.

[Zorin] It is absolutely absurd to place Afghanistan and Nicaragua on the same board. In one case it is a matter of aid to a legal government against aggression and in the other it is aggression against the legal government.

[Falin] There is also a third point. We are ready at any moment to withdraw our contingent from Afghanistan.

[Arbatov interrupts] We are striving for that, we are ready for it, we are striving to withdraw.

[Falin] Essentially we have just one condition, an end to intervention from abroad. As for Nicaragua, the Americans actually stipulate their right to intervene in the affairs of this state in the future, according to the theory formulated by the Secretary of State Shultz after the U.S. attack on Grenada that the world after Grenada will never be what it was before Grenada. That is how it was put.

[Owen] Grenada is a small island to which the United States was invited by neighboring countries to put an end to internal insurrection.

[Arbatov] I think that the United States first asked the neighboring countries to ask it to go into that country.

[Falin] It was not case of call girl, but a call boy, in this case.

[Owen] Compared with Afghanistan it was on a completely different scale and in essence this is a problem different from Nicaragua. With regard to Nicaragua, the United States says in its defense that it is worried by Cuban influence. I am not defending the U.S. position with regard to Nicaragua and I hope that you will not defend the continued Soviet presence in Afghanistan. We can understand why these problems have arisen. I agree with you that a problem arose for you. It all occurred on your border and I understand this problem. I do not believe that you were guided by offensive considerations with a desire to gain new territories. Speaking frankly, I think that you acted out of defensive considerations. But the fact remains that you are there. I only want to say that the nonaligned countries, not to mention Great Britain, West Germany, and others -- the nonaligned countries are criticizing the Soviet Union over its presence in Afghanistan, and the United States over intervention in Nicaragua. And we must listen to the nonaligned states of the Third World. I think that justice is on their side in both issues.

[Bahr] I think we should not argue too much about Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Grenada, and so forth. Let us return to your question. I hope that the West European countries will be sufficiently strong to oppose any manifestation of unilateralism by the U.S. side in Europe. I believe I have not voted for those leaders who now decide the question of my destiny as this relates to nuclear armaments. I really want to get rid of them. That will also mean a reduction of the potential threat presented to West European countries by conventional armaments and armed forces of the Warsaw Pact.

This is now the basis that was created by your general secretary. Let us begin talks on this group of questions. This may change the situation in Europe. Agreement in this sphere will retain its value even in case the two great powers do not achieve immediate results in their strategic arms talks.

[Zorin] When I read the statements of fairly many neoglobalism supporters in the United States, Mr Bahr, I remember one of your aphorisms which I like very much. You said once that stupidity does not become more attractive if it is displayed collectively.

[Bahr] Yes [laughs].

[Zorin] Mr Owen, I hope you will not complain about the question which I want to ask you. I know that you graduated with degrees in neurology and psychiarty at Cambridge University, is that so?

[Owen] Right.

[Zorin] In this connection, I would like to ask you about your attitude on the fear of the Soviet threat being fanned by certain circles.

[Owen] I think that the West could never understand what a shock World War II was for the Soviet people, for their consciousness, and the influence on them of the great losses suffered by your country. Few realize when they travel from the airport to Moscow, that the German troops had been in the very outskirts of the Soviet capital, and I think that all this has had additional influence on and has even increased the historic tendencies of the Soviet military to over insure themselves, to create a surplus while striving to ensure security. I think that you were always inclined to take a pessimistic point of view. And you, too, Georgiy, give an example of this, particularly in this discussion.

So, I shall not exaggerate too much by saying that you have created very large land forces, and that you have a considerable amount of equipment, many more tanks than we have for example. It does not follow from this that you are threatening us or want war. Personally, I do not think there is any serious likelihood of attack, incursion, or war in Europe. I think that we have reached a certain level of understanding.

I think that relaxation of tension has never meant that the ideological struggle between communism and the Western democracies would be stopped. What we wanted to achieve was putting order in our relations. I think that this has been done but to a far from sufficient extent. This is why I do not think the Soviet Union presents a threat as an aggressive military force. But like you, I want to be vigilant but preferably at a much lower level of conventional and nuclear forces. I do not think that you intend to attack us. I do not think that you are planning a threat or an attack. I think that those who in the West speak about the USSR in the language of these notions are in the minority. I do not think that they represent the view of the majority in the Western community. And when they speak in this manner, they themselves become the objects of gibes. That does not mean at all that we must not be vigilant. We are well aware that we have different ideologies and that you strive to spread communist ideology. But I do not think that you have the intention of spreading it with the aid of armed aggression. I do not think that at all.

[Arbatov] I have had no training in psychiatry or neurology and therefore I find it more difficult to judge the state of the minds of others, but I find it strange that in the West they did not understand why the Soviet Union was forced to pay such attention to its defense after the war. Take the U.S. nuclear monopoly, for instance. I do not want to repeat the entire history, our version of the beginning of the cold war and compare it with your version. It was nevertheless a reality which I remember very well as a fully aware man. During the first postwar years we really felt the great threat from those who had been our allies which we had not expected and which disappointed us.

Now we must not think about the past. I hope that you, as a politician as well as a neurologist and psychiatrist, can link the two and invent ways to overcome these psychological barriers and open the way for new thinking in order to understand that all this talk about the threat, all this is mad hatter's talk -- if we use the language of English classics and "Alice in Wonderland". This is not possible now. Europe cannot allow a conventional war, let alone a nuclear war. We must move away from this and think about something very different. There are other tasks.

Most of the time we waste time in political dialogue, unfortunately, on problems of yesterday, although the problems of today and tomorrow -- European world, and national problems in every country -- are growing threateningly around us. It is important to achieve a change here. Therefore, it is necessary to drop the burden of old thinking, of old doctrines, old policies, the old type of foreign political behavior and the old system in international relations.

[Falin] There is a paradox that should not be overlooked. They always feared us, during the 20th century at least, and we always got hit. We always overarmed ourselves before a war, and until we reached the Volga we did not realize that we had not overarmed ourselves.

[Arbatov interrupts] Until the Germans reached the Volga.

[Falin] Yes. After the war we were forced to rearm to make it more difficult to rebuild the economy. But they said we were rearming and threatening. Here we must someday find the same watershed which we are seeking now in other issues between the true and the false. When we find it it will be easier to understand each other.

[Zorin] I would like to ask our guests the following question: Currently European political circles are discussing the destiny of the SALT treaty. Mr Owen, what is your point of view on the issue?

[Owen] I think that the limitations imposed by SALT II were very significant and that they must be preserved. I think that this treaty aroused some disappointment as it provided for further growth without ensuring reduction of existing armaments. I would be very glad if we could now reach an agreement on reduction of strategic armaments, and would not object to abandoning SALT II in this case, as it would simply be incorporated in the new agreement. I think that President Reagan would display wisdom if he did not violate the limitations imposed by the agreement before a new agreement is worked out. It should not be abandoned at the present stage and I hope that he will not do that. I think that Congress, the Democratic and Republican senators, will put serious pressure on him to observe the limitations imposed by that agreement.

[Zorin] Mr Bahr, considering that you said that you did not come to Moscow to condemn your allies, nevertheless I would like to ask you about your attitude toward statements by U.S. leaders who have said they want to abandon the SALT II treaty.

[Bahr] I share the view expressed by David Owen. I can only add that all the arguments expressed by our U.S. allies in favor of abandoning SALT II failed to convince a single NATO foreign minister, including those who represent very conservative governments. Thus, for the first time in the history of the bloc, we were faced with the fact that all the other members came out with criticisms of the statement made by Reagan to the effect that he will no longer consider himself bound by the SALT II treaty conditions as this will lead to an unlimited strategic arms race.

[Falin] I think there is an important moment or two here. The first is that the SALT II treaty was not just a treaty limitation. It was also a treaty on reducing strategic armaments. Had the treaty been ratified, the strategic forces would have been reduced substantially, by over 10 percent. That would have been a first step toward a more serious reduction which was to be negotiated within the framework of SALT III. The second point is what is no longer mentioned now but what was mentioned by Adelman 2-3 years ago. Less was said then about so-called violations of the treaty with the Soviet Union and more was said about the fallacious principles at the basis of the treaty. In a message to the Senate, Adelman said that the main reason for our not ratifying the treaty is not that we do not want to extend it, but that we do not want to make the principles of the treaty a law of the United States. And the basis of the treaty has as its main principle equality and equal security.

[Zorin] I would like to touch on another topic and my question is for you, Valentin Mikhaylovich. I woul like you to answer this question in the presence of Mr Bahr. You are a well-known specialist on problems connected with the FRG and a former Soviet ambassador to that country. I would like to ask you what has been happening lately with that country's policy.

[Falin] There is much happening with that country's policy. That country's policy is looking predominantly to the past and not the future. A look back does not always prevent us from seeing what is facing us, though it unnecessarily reminds us about what has happened in the past.

I think that some of the things we recognized, that both sides recognized as necessary and essential in the seventies, have been forgotten. More precisely, this was to avoid actions that could threaten the interests of both sides, to understand ourselves as part of something more substantially common, such as all-European security. Today we hear arguments to the effect that regardless of whether it is advantageous to the Soviet side, it is advantageous to the security of Western Europe. This is what we object to categorically. What may be advantageous to us can be rejected by us without any prompting from your Western side if only because a decrease in security for the United States in Western Europe would mean at the same time a decreased security for the Soviet Union and our friends.

I think the maintenance of mutually advantageous economic relations has become considerably more difficult, particularly because there is more discrimination in these relations and more preconditions set by the Western side. There is a whole series of other points which should not be dramatized possibly, but which are unfortunately circumstances impossible to bypass.

[Zorin] Mr Bahr, there is no need for you to speak against your allies here, but I would like to hear your opinion on this topic.

[Bahr] Ha, you know I can make it rather short. I have every reason, as has my party, to strive to replace the present government. One of the main reasons lies in the fact that we are convinced that a new round of Ostpolitik, as we call it, is necessary, a new round in the policy of detente. We would like to affirm a long-term trend in politics the result of which would be a situation in which not a single state could attack one country from another, in which not a single country would be capable of beginning an attack, particularly with the aid of conventional weapons. As far as nuclear arms are concerned I (?would not) have a say.

At the same time it is essential that we establish economic cooperation that would serve as an additional support in the common interests of maintaining this economic cooperation so that we could say, let the next generation solve the remaining problems.

[Zorin] I would like to continue this topic and ask you, Mr Owen, what has happened recently in British politics? To be frank, I would like to say that personally, as an independent factor, I have been unable to fathom this British policy of late.

[Owen] I think that Britain is a very close friend of the United States and this is conditioned by the historic development of our countries. Of course I would not overestimate the significance of the slow shift that is occurring in Britain since its entry into the European Community. We did this late, only in 1973, but if you continue to look at Britain as a country linked only to the United States and not with Europe, then I think you have missed a fairly important and substantial change.

With every year, Britain is becoming an increasingly European power although it continues to preserve, and I hope it will continue to preserve, close and friendly relations with the United States.

But we increasingly understand that as a result of the fact that our empire has disappeared, that our former colonies have received independence, that our economic positions have weakened, that our country can preserve its influence only as a European power if it plays a more important role in Europe. That is why I attach so much significance to relations in the sphere of defense and nuclear arms between France, Britain, and Germany.

I believe a strong, unified, and democratic Europe, which is somewhat more confident in itself and in its relations with the United States, will increasingly correspond with the interests of the Soviet Union. We do not intend to reject the United States. Not one of us wants this, and this will not happen. But I believe a more genuinely purely European point of view will emerge and in step with the emergence of this European point of view, it is quite natural that insofar as we are all European and live on the one continent we will share identical views on some issues with the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

For example, I have no reason to defend our prime minister, Mrs Thatcher, for just like Egon, I hope that at the next elections we will come to power and form our government. She is often depicted as a very close friend of President Reagan. But when the question arose of applying sanctions and ending cooperation in the sphere of construction of the gas pipeline, which is of great significance to you and to Eastern Europe, we refused to follow the U.S. course. This was an incorrect course, the introduction of sanctions was a mistake, and we refused to do this.

You must not think that Britain is simply and completely in the United States' pocket. There have been instances when I think we adopted wrong decisions. I think that Britain made a wrong decision on the Libyan issue, which I think is a controversial issue. If you consider yourself a friend and an ally, you must be ready to support the actions of your ally even if you do not agree with him. It must be done from time to time.

You do the same with regard to your allies. Thus, I can say that at times, I get the impression that the Soviet Union is striving to break Europe from the United States. You want to split us up. I think this is a fruitless effort. We cannot be broken away from the United States. It is far more important that you encourage dialogue between our countries so that Western Europe becomes more confident in itself and in its relations with the United States and becomes more united. The greater our unity, the more influence we will have and the more influence we can exert on the United States. That may be immodest on my part but I think this influence will also be beneficial for the United States.

[Arbatov] I would like to object, however. There may be philistines among us who think that way...

[Zorin interrupts] We are realists.

[Arbatov] Who thinks of splitting Europe from its ally, the United States? We do not set such a goal, first of all, because we are realists and understand this is impossible, and second, because we want to have good and normal relations with both Western Europe and the United States. We do not think that a bloc policy of pulling the weight this way and not giving the weight to the other side of these scales can change anything. That is not the way to solve world problems. So we are not for splitting your alliance but for seeing that alliance conducting a proper policy. If that does happen, please be friendly with the United States. [as heard]

[Falin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, there is a very important point in David Owen's statement, precisely that in conditions of detente and normal relations the weight of states, large ones like England and smaller ones, normally grows.

The countries gain additional possibilities for self-expression, for representing and promoting their interests. In this sense the weight of the military factor created or not created by the superpowers is leveled out. That is a very important point.

[Arbatov] This situation of tension is a kind of state of emergency in which no one has the right to act according to his wishes.

[Zorin] In as much as our time is drawing to a close, I would like to offer each of the participants 2 minutes to answer the question about how you view prospects for the development of the political process. Let us begin with you, Valentin Mikhaylovich.

[Falin] The prospects will depend on what we do this year and the beginning of next year. I want to believe, I may have no justification for that, yet I would like to believe that we shall consider not only what is correct today but what will also be correct for the next generation. We must not deprive that generation by handing over problems, thinking that generation will be wiser and will solve them; it may be wiser than we are but it will be deprived of the possibility of solving them because we will create conditions for not solving them.

[Zorin] Mr. Owen.

[Owen] I think the current year is a watershed year, and it is very important that the United States and the USSR hold a meeting. I think the personalities of these two leaders, Gorbachev and Reagan -- I have met them both -- and am convinced that the personality factor is of great significance. So I consider it important that they meet. It is very important that they lay the foundations for progress. I think Europe can exert its influence. East European countries will be able to influence the Soviet Union, its position at the talks, so that at times it will display more flexibility. I think the West European democracies can exert a beneficial effect on the United States and convince it to go to the conference table to reach a concrete agreement and concrete treaties. We should use our influence. If we do that, it is possible that by 1987 we will again return to regulated relations between our countries.

In the meantime, I think exchanges of views, discussions on controversial issues, will be of great significance. We have discussed many controversial problems at this table like Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and others. I think this kind of dialogue between our countries will reach millions of people, increases mutual understanding, and strengthen confidence; and that is the basis of general security.

[Zorin] Mr Bahr.

[Bahr] We are on one globe. Nevertheless, Chernobyl has shown that we can live either in conditions of common danger or in conditions of common security. It has shown that our common European home does in fact exist. Let us unite our efforts to develop European security. This will also be very good for the rest of the planet.

[Arbatov] I have already been accused of pessimism. I would say that I think that a difficult period awaits us, an uneasy time and that very radical changes, very radical changes are needed. Our enemies are not just those who do not want these changes. Our enemies are, [changes thought] working against us is the force of many centuries of tradition, even thousands of years of habits and traditions and the inertia of all those thousands of years when these questions were solved by war and the force of war. This must be overcome.

Nevertheless this is incredibly difficult and very complex. Mankind has never solved this kind of task and on the other hand never has such a danger hung over it nor has such an objective situation pressed it to solve this task. I think that this will be no easy task, but regardless of how difficult it is, we simply have no right to avoid solving it.

This task is on the agenda of history and we cannot accept no as an answer. It must be solved and I would like to conclude with the words of a great English materialist -- you see how I have refreshed my memory in your honor David -- Francis Bacon, who said that man must not only seek opportunities, he must create them. I think that we, the Soviet Union, has tried to do this during the past year, and we have done so most actively.

[Zorin] Well, it remains for me to thank the participants in our interesting discussion and to express the hope that this is not our last meeting here in our Studio 9, and to thank our television viewers for their attention. And so, until our next meeting in Studio 9, thank you.

NUCLEAR OFFICIAL URGES INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

LD161254 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0843 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jul (TASS) -- The Soviet Union is preparing a list of international measures for security at nuclear power stations, Andronik Petrosyants, Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Utilization of Atomic Energy, has told a MOSCOW NEWS correspondent. He gave the interview in connection with the adopting by the IAEA of a special decision noting the need for cooperation between states in improving reliability and security at nuclear power stations.

First, it is extremely important to create international standards and instructions on the use of nuclear power stations and also to establish a system for giving notification of accidents, continued Andronik Petrosyants. There is also a need to prepare a treaty to avoid attacks on nuclear power stations. Unfortunately, the world has already experienced just such an incident, said Andronik Petrosyants, referring to the Israeli attack on the nuclear research reactor in Iraq. There is also the question of approving a convention on the physical defense of nuclear materials and equipment.

The committee chairman saw the IAEA plan to hold a special conference at the end of this year or the beginning of next year on matters concerning AES security as positive.

EXPANDING APPLICATION OF IAEA PROPOSED

PM091405 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 27, Jun 86 (Signed to Press 26 Jun 86) p 23

[V. Kuchinov "Economic Review": "IAEA and the Peaceful Atom" -- first two paragraphs printed in boldface italics]

[Excerpts] It is impossible to imagine the modern economy without the use of atomic energy, whose sphere of application is rapidly expanding. Today this sphere covers industry, agriculture, medicine, and many other fields of human activity.

But the use of this energy for generating electricity is the most important and the largest. According to IAEA data, by the end of 1985 nuclear power stations produced about 15 percent of the world's electricity, while in some countries they accounted for more than 50 percent. Some 374 power reactors with a total capacity of about 250,000 megawatts were operating in 26 countries in the world. [passage omitted]

"We believe," M.S. Gorbachev said in his 14 May 1986 speech on Soviet television, "that the Chernobyl accident, like the accidents at U.S., British, and other nuclear power stations, presents all states with very serious questions which demand a responsible attitude... We consider it necessary to advocate a serious deepening of cooperation within the IAEA framework."

Constructive Program

The program for deepening cooperation within the IAEA framework put forward by the Soviet Union is based on the need to create a more effective international regime for the safe development of nuclear power engineering on the basis of close cooperation by all states working in the nuclear power field. It is necessary to introduce within the framework of such a regime a system for the prompt notification and provision of information in the event of accidents or breakdowns at nuclear power stations, and particularly when they are accompanied by leaks of radioactivity. It is equally necessary to tune up the international machinery on both a bilateral and multilateral basis for the purpose of swift provision of mutual assistance when dangerous situations develop. It is proposed to convene a highly authoritative specialized international conference under IAEA auspices to discuss this issue.

Bearing in mind that the agency was set up back in 1957 and that its resources and staff are no longer commensurate with the level of development of today's nuclear power engineering, it would be advisable to enhance the role and potential of this unique international organization. The United Nations itself and its specialized institutions like the WHO and the UN Environment Program must be more actively involved in the various measures to ensure the safe development of peaceful nuclear power engineering.

Moreover, as M.S. Gorbachev noted in his 9 June speech in Budapest, thought could possibly be given to, for example, the idea of organizing cooperation within the IAEA framework between leading countries in nuclear power engineering to create an economic and, mainly, a more reliable new-generation reactor. Particular attention must also be given to the elaboration of the question concerning material and moral-psychological damage in the event of nuclear accidents. A legally binding system must be introduced, under which states would pledge to provide free medical assistance, housing, and other material support for the victims. This must, of course, rule out all attempts to exploit accidents for the purpose of whipping up tension and mistrust in relations between states.

Our country constantly reminds other states, primarily those possessing nuclear weapons, that a more terrifying problem -- that of the military atom -- exists in parallel with the problem of the peaceful atom, and that the existing nuclear arsenals are capable of producing a catastrophe that would be far more terrible than all accidents that have hitherto occurred at nuclear power stations.

The nuclear age imperatively demands a new approach to international relations and the pooling of efforts by states with different social systems to terminate the pernicious arms race and radically improve the political climate in the world. Scope will then be available for fruitful international cooperation in utilizing the latest achievements of science and technology for the benefit of all people on earth.

REAGAN MEETS PAKISTAN'S PRIME MINISTER JUNEJO

Comments on DRA

LD170725 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 17 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 17 TASS -- Pakistan's Prime Minister, Mohammed Khan Junejo, who is staying here on an official visit, has met with President Reagan. During the meeting the head of the American Administration made a speech which contained a fair amount of anti-Soviet allegations over the situation around Afghanistan. The President expressed sympathy with Pakistan which had been "drawn" into a conflict with Afghanistan, although the whole world knows that Pakistan has found itself in this situation through the fault of the U.S. Government. Washington gives Pakistan military and economic aid on condition that the latter keeps the bases of anti-Afghan counterrevolutionaries on its territory and does not fail to pass U.S.-supplied arms over to them.

Visit Viewed

LD162207 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Boris Adrianov commentary]

[Text] According to reports from Washington, Mohammed Khan Junejo, the prime minister of Pakistan, has arrived there for a 1-week official visit. The program for his stay in the United States includes talks with President Reagan, Vice President Bush, Defense Secretary Weinberger, and Secretary of State Shultz. Boris Andrianov is at the microphone with a commentary:

Just by itself, the list of the officials whom the Pakistani prime minister is meeting shows that the U.S. Administration is giving him a first class reception; and, to all appearances, it sees a reason for this and the transoceanic press perceives it too. Here, for example, is the opinion of the influential NEW YORK TIMES. It considers that the White House has decided to create a reputation for Junejo in Washington circles. This is supposedly linked with the fact that Reagan intends, next year, to ask Congress for more allocations for military aid to Pakistan. In other words, they have made up their minds in Washington to use Junejo's visit to present the Pakistani regime in the most favorable light to the U.S. public. After all, the visitor from Islamabad who has arrived across the ocean is a civilian and, although not he but the dictator Zia-ul-Haq runs the affairs of the country, nevertheless the White House wants to give the impression that Junejo's arrival symbolizes the restoration of democracy in Pakistan.

In actual fact, there isn't even the outward appearance of democracy there. How can there be any question of it in that country, where, just 6 months ago, after coming up against powerful public pressure, Zia-ul-Haq was compelled to abolish martial law. The so-called civilian government, set up as a blind, acts as no more than a screen for Islamabad's military regime. There is good reason why the Pakistani opposition parties formed a large-scale alliance, the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy. It calls for an end to the illegal regime that rules the country and for free general elections to be held. In reply to that, Islamabad demonstrates its readiness to step up its repression of the opposition. That is the import of at least one declaration by Zia-ul-Haq to the effect that he is prepared to crush any opposition. In addition to all this, the dictator threatens to introduce martial law once again.

Well, clearly, that is no concern of Washington's. It has completely different interests linked with Pakistan. The U.S. WALL STREET JOURNAL writes quite frankly about this. It indicates, in particular, that the United States will only continue military and economic aid to Pakistan if the Islamabad regime becomes even more actively involved in Washington's anti-Afghan adventure.

Just before the start of Junejo's transoceanic visit, the Islamabad authorities were giving nothing away, as the saying goes, declaring that the agenda for the Washington talks had not been drawn up.

However, it is now perfectly obvious that it is a question there of extending the militarist ties between the United States and Zia-ul-Haq's military regime, and of stepping up U.S. aid to the gangs of Afghan dushmans. In this connection, the U.S. television company CBS acknowledges that Pakistan is paying an increasingly high price for the use of its territory as a springboard for conducting an undeclared war against Afghanistan.

DOBRYNIN RECEIVES FORMER PRESIDENT NIXON

LD161805 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- Former U.S. President Richard Nixon was received today by Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin at the former's request.

They thoroughly discussed questions determining the present-day state of Soviet-American relations.

U.S. MANEUVERS OFF THAILAND, LIBYA DENOUNCED

LD142204 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Two regions of the world far removed from each other and from the United States are now witnessing developments remarkably similar in nature. One is the Gulf of Siam, off Thailand, where ships of the United States' Indian Ocean-based 7th Fleet are congregating. The flotilla includes vessels carrying nuclear weapons, and even the battleship New Jersey which once bombarded Vietnam, then pounded Beirut with shells each weighing 1 ton and has now returned to the familiar coast of Indochina. The other region is the Gulf of Sidra off Libya, where ships of the United States' Mediterranean-based 6th Fleet are coming together.

The American-Thai naval maneuvers focus on landing operations conducted in the immediate vicinity of the Kampuchean border. In the Mediterranean, American fighters are intruding into Libyan airspace in preparation for what western news agencies believe to be plans for a new anti-Libyan military operation, the third of its kind.

The provocative nature of these American exercises in both areas stares one in the face. This is Washington's way of shaking a fist to threaten countries whose policy annoys it, and these are not isolated cases. The American Administration has taken under its wing Afghan terrorists, UNITA bandits in Angola, and the South African racists. Just a short while ago Washington came forward with $100 million for American mercenaries fighting against Nicaragua. Of course all this, we are told, is being done in the name of defending the ideals of peace and freedom, but in fact what we see is direct massive pressure being exerted on independent countries and support with weapons and money being given to terrorist groups and regimes. This policy is referred to in Washington as the doctrine of new globalism.

Essentially however, this is nothing but an attempt to return to the old classical sort of (?speak) system of international piracy, an attempt which in our turbulent nuclear missile age can seriously undermine international security and peace.

COMMENTATOR NOTES U.S. 'ISOLATION' AT UN

LD151011 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Mikhail Glebov commentary]

[Text] The United States Mission at the United Nations has submitted a report to the administration saying that at the latest session of the General Assembly on 77 percent of the resolutions most countries voted against, not together with, the United States. Mikhail Glebov writes the following on the subject:

The results of the last session were quite illuminating. Washington politicians can claim all they like that America is a model to everyone, and everything but facts are more eloquent than words. The world community rejects American recipes. The session showed differences between the United States and the rest of the world on most cardinal issues. For example, United Nations members passed 46 disarmament resolutions while the United States abstained from voting or voted against 37 of them, 7 cases in total isolation. On the whole, voting at the United Nations showed that the concepts of peaceful coexistence and arms reduction, formulated in the proposals of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and developing nations, had won general approval.

The main subject of discussion at the United Nations today is the detailed Soviet plan for scrapping nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The American Government, with its stubborn refusal to stop nuclear tests and work on the star wars program, invariably finds itself in the minority group. The report of the United States mission shows this contradiction between the American stand and the views of the majority. The admission of this contradiction is probably the only evaluation taking reality into account.

American leaders draw a strange conclusion from the situation. They want to make all other countries change their views. This is precisely what the United States wants. A State Department report about the United Nations has openly said that the leading role of America in the affairs of international organizations should be restored so that the activities of these organizations meet United States interests. According to this logic the world should have nothing more important than United States interests. Those who disagree will be punished, for the administration has announced that the stand of every country will be taken into account when the question of American loans and various aid will be raised.

Now, after the publication of the report, Washington threatens that the countries mentioned in the document will be punished without delay. The conclusion that can be drawn from all these declarations is evident: American leaders stubbornly refuse to see reality. On the contrary, they entertain illusions about imposing their views on the whole world. Apparently they can not forget the first years of the United Nations, when almost half of its members were obedient Latin American regimes and giant expanses on the world map were painted in colors of European colonial powers. But those days are gone. Scores of countries have won independence and the right to decide for themselves what they like and dislike. No efforts of threats of financial blackmail can reverse these changes.

U.S. COMMITTEE OPPOSES DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT

LD170855 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 17 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The notorious Committee on the Present Danger has made another contribution to the heightening of world tension. It published a large report which categorically opposed any agreements with the Soviet Union on arms control.

The United States should arm itself, only arm itself and nothing else -- this is the way for the U.S. to achieve security, in the opinion of the committee. The authors of the report support with special zeal the "star wars" program which, according to the estimates of Rand Corporation -- a conservative brain trust -- can cost U.S. taxpayers a fantastic sum of about two trillion dollars. No one is very much surprised over this stand of the committee, for it is common knowledge that it is funded by the military-industrial complex.

CORRECTION TO U.S. REJECTION OF MIDEAST PROPOSAL

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Rejection of Mideast Proposal Confirms U.S. Policy," published in the 14 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page A 4, paragraph five, lines two and three:

...notorious doctrine of "neo-globalism", does not confrom... (correcting typo in "neo-globalism")

GERASIMOV CRITICIZES JAPANESE MILITARY POLICIES

LD151147 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jul (TASS) -- Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, has said that there is an obvious discrepancy between the activation of Japanese-U.S. military cooperation that may be observed now and the statements by the Japanese leadership concerning its adherence to the "three non-nuclear principles" and its aspiration to decrease the tension in the Asian-Pacific region.

Speaking at a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center today, he pointed out that such cooperation between Japan and the United States in the military sphere includes visits by U.S. warships with nuclear weapons on board to Japanese ports and the deployment on Japanese territory of U.S. aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized that the cooperation between Japan and the United States in the military sphere, and Japan's involvement in U.S. adventurous actions does not contribute to the strenghtening of peace in the Far East and in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole.

MONGOLIAN LEADER CONVEYS MESSAGE OF THANKS

PM151353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 First Edition p 1

[Message from Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairmain of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium; and Dumaagiyn Sodnom, chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers, to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and to Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] To Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;

To Comrade Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

To Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

On behalf of the MPRP Central Committee, the Presidium of the People's Great Hural, and the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, and the communists and working people of our country, we express deep gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, the fraternal Soviet people, and you, dear comrades, for the cordial congratulations and good wishes on the 65th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Revolution.

The People's Revolution of 1921 was a turning point in the Mongolian people's fate and enabled them to take the bright road illuminated by the ideas of Great October, the road of national rebirth and socialist creation.

In the years of people's power our people, under the leadership of their Marxist-Leninist vanguard, the MPRP, and in close fraternal alliance with Lenin's motherland, have traveled a glorious path of struggle and victories. The historical experience of Mongolia's development and its present-day reality convincingly confirm the viability of the all-conquering teaching of Marxism-Leninism, the tremendous potential of the socialist system, and the creative force of the close collaboration of revolutionary peoples on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism.

On this day of their revolution's glorious anniversary, Mongolian Communists and all our people note with profound and cordial gratitude to the Soviet people that real socialism on Mongolian soil, the growing pace of Mongolia's economic and social development, and the constantly rising standard of the working people's well-being are the fruits of fraternal friendship and close, fruitful cooperation with the great Soviet Union. The implementation of the objectives of the program for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between Mongolia and the USSR through the year 2000 opens up still broader prospects for the successful resolution of tasks to complete the construction of the material and technical base of socialism in our country.

Today the working class, cooperative peasantry, and people's intelligentsia of socialist Mongolia, in an atmosphere of great political and labor enthusiasm and growing creative initiative, are embarking on the fulfillment of the decisions of the 19th MPRP Congress, which outlined the program tasks of the country's economic and social development for the coming years. Their full implementation will be a new step in the acceleration of our progress along the path of socialist building.

Mongolian Communists and our country's working people will do everything possible to ensure that the relations of fraternal friendship, all-around cooperation, and rapprochement between the MPRP and the CPSU, Mongolia and the USSR steadily widen and deepen for the sake of the Mongolian and Soviet peoples, in the name of the strengthening of the unity and might of the entire socialist community, and in the interests of ensuring peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region and throughout the world.

We are profoundly pleased and inspired by the energetic actions of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to implement the great program for achieving a qualitatively new state in the acceleration and intensification of economic, scientific, technical, and social development of the USSR put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress, which will play a decisive part in increasing the might and magnetic force of world socialism and strengthening its positions.

Mongolia, together with the fraternal countries, will make efforts to promote in every way the implementation of the historic Soviet initiatives aimed at delivering mankind, this century, from nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction and at creating an all-embracing system of international security. These initiatives make up the common platform of all the forces opposed to the danger of war and the threat of nuclear disaster and give new impetus to their struggle.

We wholeheartedly wish you, dear comrades, and the fraternal Soviet people happiness and prosperity and new achievements in the implementation of the historic 27th CPSU Congress decisions, in the cause of the all-around acceleration of the socioeconomic development of the land of the Soviets, and in the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of world peace and mankind's bright future, without wars or weapons.

With Communist greetings.

Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium;

Dumaagiyn Sodnom, chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers.

MONGOLIAN AMBASSADOR LAUDS BILATERAL RELATIONS

LD112014 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Talk by Tserengiyn Gurbadam, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the MPR to the Soviet Union, speaking in Russian -- from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Esteemed friends, during the years of people's power the MPR has traveled the road from the feudal backwardness of the colonial past to today's boundaries of real socialism. Figuratively speaking, the country has stepped over an entire epoch in historical development. Our successes in the building of a new life are indisputably significant but no less important and no less large-scale tasks lie ahead. The 19th MPRP Congress, which took place recently, mapped out new lofty targets for Mongolia's social and economic development and for further improving the well-being of our people.

In talking about our achievements and tasks which lie ahead, we note gratefully that they are all inseparably linked with Mongolian-Soviet friendship, whose inextinguishable torch was lit 65 years ago by the great Lenin and Sukhebator, leader of our revolution. Mongolian people feel deep satisfaction over the steady strengthening of our friendship and the prospects for deepening it which are recorded in the bilateral founding documents and also in the accords of our leaders, Comrade Batmonh and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We are sincerely happy at the impressive achievements of the Soviet people in the building of a new society, and we follow with fraternal interest that enormous work being carried out in your splendid country to implement the strategic directives of the historic 27th CPSU Congress.

The MPR consistently advocates peace and the security of peoples and supports the complex of the Soviet Union's constructive peace initiatives as the only sensible alternative for radically resolving the most burning problems of the present age, including problems connected with consolidating peace in Asia. We will continue, together with all progressive peace-loving forces, to struggle against the adventuristic intrigues of bellicose circles of imperialism.

Dear Soviet friends; from the bottom of my heart I wish you happiness, prosperity, great successes and a peaceful environment. Thank you for your attention.

U.S., ROK 'OBSTRUCTIONIST STANCE' CRITICIZED

PM150953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Whipping Up Tension]

[Text] Pyongyang, 13 Jul -- The newspaper NODONG SINMUN published a commentary on the obstructionist stance of the United States and the Seoul regime as regards the DPRK's new peace proposal -- to conduct talks with the participation of the DPRK minister of the People's Armed Forces, the commander in chief of UN Armed Forces in South Korea, and the South Korean defense minister.

In a demonstration of good will and sincere interest in the quest for effective measures aimed at strengthening peace and security in the Korean Peninsula, the republic repeated its proposal on 11 July. But the United States and the South Korean side refused to accept the letter from Vice Marshal of the Korean People's Army O Chin-u, DPRK minister of the People's Armed Forces.

DPRK CONDEMNS U.S. REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE

LD141342 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] Pyongyang July 14 TASS -- The U.S. and South Korea's refusal to accept the proposal for negotiations between military leaders is a grave challenge to the DPRK's efforts aimed at attaining relaxation of tension and safeguarding peace in Korea, says a statement of the Ministry of the People's Armed Forces of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which was distributed here today.

The statement was delivered at a press conference by Deputy Chief of General Staff of the Korean People's Army Major General Yi Hong-sung, who denounced Washington's and Seoul's negative stand.

The DPRK's new peace initiative, the statement says, is aimed at removing the threat of war in the Korean Peninsula, relaxing the state of acute military confrontation there and creating an atmosphere for a dialogue in Korea.

The U.S. unwillingness to consider these problems is an attempt to avoid responsibility for its actions in heightening tension in that region, showing that while talking of "peace" and "dialogue", they in Washington crave for confrontation and war.

The United States should respond without delay to the DPRK's peace proposals, stop aggressive preparations in South Korea and withdraw all its troops and nuclear weapons from there without delay. The statement calls upon the governments and the peoples of all countries to continue supporting the rightful struggle of the Korean people for peace in Korea.

PDPA CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM HELD IN KABUL

PM161041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Urgent Tasks: PDPA Central Committee Plenum Held"]

[Text] Kabul, 11 Jul -- The routine 19th plenum of the PDPA Central Committee has been held here. A report "On the Urgent Tasks of the Party and State Power" was delivered by Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee. He noted, in particular, that it is the plenum's task to discuss the basic problems of the present moment and the cardinal tasks of the further development of the party and state.

The development of the victorious revolution is a complex and, in many ways, contradictory process, during which there may be advances and retreats and a regrouping of forces, Najibullah said. The party must explain with new force that the national democratic revolution is developing in the interests of all working people, ethnic groups, and tribes, of all patriotic strata of Afghan society. At the same time, it should be remembered that the present stage of the revolution will, by all appearances, be prolonged and difficult. That is why we once again emphasize: Our first priority is to expand our work among the masses, acquire new friends and political allies, and strengthen our revolutionary democratic system. Only in this way will we be able to isolate and then suppress the domestic counterrevolution, eradicate banditry, close our borders to enemies, secure an end to bloodshed, and establish peace and national concord in the country.

The revolution's strength lies in the irreversible, consistent nature of its progress, in renewal, in its orientation forward and only forward, in constant self-development, in the critical reinterpretation of all that has been achieved. That is precisely what we have lacked, the speaker pointed out. We allowed the decisions of Central Committee plenums, the Revolutionary Council, and the government to remain on paper. We mostly instructed our long-suffering, courageous people and were bad at learning from them, forgetting that the people, in their masses, are wiser and more experienced than any leader. We lacked party responsibility, persistence in pursuing something, once begun, to the end.

We see the way out of the existing situation in the restructuring of party political work and all spheres of public life. This applies to questions of military, state, and economic building, as well as to the methods of work with cadres, the expansion and strengthening of the social base, and the party's links with the masses.

Touching on certain questions of military building, Najibullah said that since the 18th plenum of the PDPA Central Committee, there has been an improvement in the organizational structure of the Armed Forces. Defense councils have been set up at all levels, from statewide to provincial. A number of successful military operations have been carried out. The decisive questions is the full provision of manpower for the Armed Forces. Here the main reserve is the draft. This must be the concern of all social and state organs, all leading workers. It is necessary to step up work in the tribes to recruit volunteers. There are shining examples of many graduates of higher educational establishments and lycees joining the army as volunteers. A problem directly connected with the level of staffing of the Armed Forces is still that of desertion. The Central Committee will seek to ensure that a reliable system of closing the border is created rapidly. War is war, and the revolutionary authorities must be extremely attentive to the memory of the fallen, the families of those killed, and the wounded and disabled. The state has appropriated hundreds of millions of Afghans to increase material assistance to these people.

All the activity of the DRA party and state leadership, the armed forces, the party, and the people must be subordinated to the main aim -- the resolute struggle against counterrevolution and the rebuttal of outside interference. A very important task for the revolutionary party which possesses political power is to create a new state, a state of councils [sovety] and jirgas (assemblies) at all levels, Najibullah went on to note. In August 1985 elections to local organs of power began, and they have already been held in the majority of provinces. But analysis shows that the new organs of power have not yet become really active organs. Not infrequently it happens like this: Elections are held, but the situation on the spot does not change significantly. Local organs of power must display exceptional persistence in the liberation of villages by peaceful political means. Complete and final victory over banditry is impossible without consolidating military successes with measures of a socioeconomic nature in the liberated regions.

A special commission to prepare a draft new constitution is working under the chairmanship of B. Karmal. The adoption of a constitution is the beginning of the huge task of state building; it will be the fundamental law on replacing emergency, temporary measures and organizations with permanent ones.

The general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee went on to say that a very important condition for resolving the nationalities question is the level of the country's political and socioeconomic development. This level, especially in certain regions, is extremely low. Within the framework of the first 5-year plan, it is expedient to elaborate programs for the social, economic, and cultural development of the country's ethnic groups, providing for preferential assistance for those who are in the most difficult position.

Special attention must be devoted to the development of such sectors as agriculture, transport, the power industry, and communications. We must continue to pursue a line of maximum development of the state sector of the economy. Financial and legal support must be given to patriotically minded businessmen. After all, they play a decisive role in the national economy today.

One topical problem at the present stage of the national democratic revolution, the speaker said, is the development and enrichment of the ideological and political base of the PDPA and the further acceleration of its role in society. The main task is to strengthen unity in the leadership of the party and among the party masses. The Politburo regards the principle of unity as the most important condition for the successful resolution of all the tasks facing the country.

Speaking about increasing the party's combat capability. Najibullan pointed out that the only true basis for strengthening all its components is democratic centralism. The party Central Committee believes that conditions are now ripe for the holding of reports and elections in the majority of primary party organizations and the expansion of democratic principles and collectivity in the work of party committees. This will make it possible to involve workers, peasants, demobilized servicemen, craftsmen, and other representatives of the working people more widely in party work.

The PDPA has proclaimed the program goal of promoting the growth of the working class and increasing its influence on all spheres of life. Today its ranks include 34 percent of workers, peasants, and craftsmen [sentence as published]. It is necessary to be more persistent in strengthening the party's foundation -- the primary party organizations. It is a priority task to set up party organizations at enterprises and in villages and to improve their activity.

The general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee dwelt on questions of further increasing the effectiveness of the work of the country's mass public and political organizations, as well as measures to bring left-wing democratic organizations now operating outside the PDPA into the revolution process. The report stressed the need to organize work among the creative intelligentsia and mass media workers.

There are very complex tasks in the foreign policy sphere, the general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee stated. In recent years there has been a marked expansion of contacts and ties between the DRA and the foreign countries, and an increase in the prestige of revolutionary Afghanistan in the international arena, where we act in close unity with our great friend the Soviet Union, the socialist community countries, and also the progressive nonaligned states. The most important task of the PDPA and the DRA government in the international arena is to ensure favorable external conditions for the total victory of the April revolution. A key avenue of this work is the political settlement of the Afghanistan situation and the normalization of relations with neighboring Pakistan and Iran. The Pakistani side and American imperialism, which is behind it, are trying to reduce the entire settlement solely to the establishment of schedules for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. We cannot agree with this approach. For Afghanistan, the main thing is an end to interference in its internal affairs, and therefore the question of the withdrawal of the Soviet contingent and the schedule for the withdrawal can only be resolved in context, in the specific interaction of all the main components making up a political settlement.

The people of Afghanistan will never forget that in the years of darkness the Soviet internationalist servicemen came to their aid. The USSR is also helping us to create the foundation for the revolutionary state's economy. Friendship with the Soviet Union is not only internationalism in action, it is also patriotism in action.

The plenum examined organizational questions. S. La'eq, candidate member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and DRA Minister for nationalities and tribal affairs, was made a member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo. N. Kawiani and Kh. Mad'ud were elected secretaries of the PDPA Central Committee. A number of candidate members of the PDPA Central Committee were made members of the PDPA Central Committee. The composition of the Central Committee was considerably broadened through the election of representatives of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia.

The plenum relieved M.Y. Sadeqi of his deputies as secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, and also removed A. Sarwari, A.G. Asad, and M.A. Farzan from the Central Committee.

The plenum adopted a decision to set up a Central Auditing Commission under the PDPA Central Committee, and elected the members. The question of the admission to the PDPA of members of the "Revolutionary Society of Working People of Afghanistan" and other left-wing democratic organizations was also examined. Appropriate resolutions were adopted on the questions discussed.

A concluding speech was delivered by Najibullan general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee.

FURTHER ON RYZHKOV DELEGATION HANOI VISIT

Heng Samrin Meeting

LD151041 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] A meeting took place today in Hanoi between the Soviet party-government delegation, led by Nikolay Ryzhkov, and the delegation of the People's Republic of Kampuchea [PRK] led by Heng Samrin Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP] Central Committee general secretary and president of the PRK Council of State.

During the conversation, which passed in a cordial, comradely atmosphere, discussion took place on further developing Soviet-Cambodian relations. There was an exchange of views on urgent problems connected with the present international situation. The Soviet side expressed its firm support for the PRK's efforts to build a new society on Cambodian soil, and for the foreign policies of the Republic, which, together with other fraternal Indochinese countries, insistently supports the improvement of the situation in Southeast Asia and turning this region into a zone of peace, stability, and good-neighborliness. The desire of both sides to continue to develop fruitful cooperation between the CPSU and the KPRP and the USSR and the PRK, in the interests of the Soviet and Cambodian peoples, and in the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world was confirmed.

Meeting With Lao Leader

LD151013 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Hanoi: The Soviet party-government delegation, headed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, which is taking part in the funeral services to mark the death of Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, today in Hanoi met the delegation from the Lao People's Democratic Republic headed by Kaysone Phomvihan, Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee general secretary and Lao Council of Ministers chairman.

During the conversation, which passed in a friendly, comradely atmosphere, the sides noted with satisfaction the successful development and deepening of fraternal Soviet-Lao relations. The Lao side highly esteemed the Soviet Union's wide-scale initiatives undertaken in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, and aimed at ending the arms race, disarmament, averting a nuclear catastrophe, and preserving and consolidating peace.

The Soviet side confirmed its support for the constructive initiatives of Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia aimed at improving the situation in Southeast Asia in the interests of all the region's states.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Kaysone Phomvihan called for the further development and intensification of cooperation between the parties and peoples of both countries in the interests of peace and socialism.

Departure for Moscow

LD151040 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] Hanoi July 15 TASS -- The Soviet party-and-government delegation led by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, who attended the mourning activities in connection with the death of Le Duan, an outstanding state and party leader of Vietnam, left here for home today.

Stopover in Tashkent

LD151805 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] On the way from Hanoi to Moscow, the USSR party and government delegation headed by Comrade Ryzhkov stopped over in Tashkent. At the airport the delegation was met and seen off by Comrade Usman Khodzhayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan; Comrade Salimov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR; Comrade Kadyrev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR; and by other republic leaders.

Met in Moscow

LD160822 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow 16 Jul (TASS) -- The party and government delegation led by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which took part in the mourning events in connection with the death of Le Duan, the eminent Vietnamese party and state figure, returned to Moscow today.

At the airport the delegation was met by Geydar Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Lev Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and other officials.

MARCHUK RECEIVES ROMANIAN SCIENCE OFFICIAL

PM161450 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A meeting took place 11 July between G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, and I. Ursu, candidate member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and first deputy chairman of the Romanian National Council for Science and Technology.

They discussed ways to implement the long-term program for the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Romania through the year 2000 and questions concerning the two countries' participation in the fulfillment of measures planned by the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000.

Romanian Ambassador to the USSR T. Dudas attended the meeting.

SOKOLOV, KULIKOV RECEIVE GDR STATE AWARDS

PM111519 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Presentation of Awards"]

[Text] On 10 July Army General H. Kessler, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR national defense minister, presented GDR state awards to Soviet military leaders at the GDR Embassy in the Soviet Union. The Order of Karl Marx was presented to Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister. The Order of Scharnhorst was presented to Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces. They were decorated for their contribution to increasing the socialist community countries' defense capability and strengthening brotherhood in arms between the USSR and GDR Armed Forces.

Army Gen H. Kessler cordially congratualted the award recipients.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov and Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov warmly thanked the SED Central Committee and the GDR State Council for the high awards.

The award presentation ceremony was attended by USSR deputy defense ministers, Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, and Army General I.N. Shkadov; and V.P. Loginov, USSR deputy foreign minister. E. Winkelmann, GDR ambassador to the USSR, was also present.

REPORTAGE ON CONCLUSION OF SHEVARDNADZE'S UK VISIT

London Press Conference

LD161640 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1546 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] London, 16 Jul (TASS) -- E,A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, has held a news conference here. Speaking to journalists, he said:

On the whole we are satisfied with the results of the talks.

We handed over a message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Prime Minister M. Thatcher and are satisfied that she accepted the invitation to visit Moscow. A similar proposal was made to G. Howe, the foreign secretary, who also accepted.

So, as you see, a continued Soviet-British dialogue is planned. This continuation gives hope. If we are to talk about how our talks went in the last 2 days, first and foremost I want to refer to the practical results achieved.

For the first time in 10 years three important agreements were signed; moreover, one of them was in the military sphere. I hope that the agreement on preventing incidents at sea will be the forerunner of other fundamental accords between us and other countries in both the East and the West on eradicating the possibility of a most terrible incident -- a nuclear conflict that could end life on earth. In order to prevent this, it is necessary to create reliable guarantees to ensure international security. This was the main element in our dialogue with Britain -- in talks that have already taken place and, doubtlessly, in future talks. In setting forth our positions on this key world problem, we proceeded from the fact that we are dealing with a major power that possesses an arsenal of nuclear weapons and significant armed forces on the European Continent. We see in Britain an equal partner without whose cooperation it is difficult to radically solve the problems of limiting and reducing weapons.

That is why in our talks here we devoted so much time to explaining the Soviet concept of guaranteeing international security in the nuclear space age. This idea was put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress and it reflects the fundamental principles of the philosophy of peace and proclaims political means for preventing a military threat to be the only possible ones. In our understanding a universal system of international security can and must function by increasing dependence on political, economic, and humanitarian measures with a total renunciation of the use of force and the banning and physical liquidation of nuclear, chemical, and space weapons.

Of course, the differences that exist between our two countries' approaches and appraisals was bound to be manifest during the talks, but there is nothing surprising in that and we shall not dramatize it. Moreover the exchange of views on contentious problems that took place seemed very useful to us. The tone of the discussions was no less important; it was full of the proper approach, a wish to clarify each partner's point of view and to strive to be utterly frank with each other.

We note the realism and sensible approach by the British side in definitely advocating compliance with the existing Soviet-U.S. SALT I and SALT II treaties as well as the ABM Treaty and progress at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments.

We share the view too that a new meeting between the top leaders of the USSR and the United States should end in substantial practical results, above all with regard to security problems. An opportunity was also revealed for joint work on such issues as banning chemical weapons and reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Both sides emphasized the importance of a successful conclusion to the Stockholm conference and of proper preparation for the Vienna meeting of states taking part in the all-European conference. Reaching an agreement on confidence-building measures in Stockholm could serve, according to our deep conviction, as a good basis for mutual understanding when resolving the problem of reducing conventional armaments.

I would like to highlight the position of the British side on the question of an ABM Treaty too. The British leadership has declared itself clearly to be in favor of rigorously observing this fundamental agreement on strategic arms limitation. We too are resolutely in favor of this.

Strengthening the conditions of an ABM treaty takes on particular significance now that the danger of extending the arms race into space has arisen. Judge for yourselves what really serves the aims of reinforcing strategic stability: removing nuclear and other means of mass destruction from the face of the earth, or deploying in space so-called "defensive devices" with unpredictable consequences for mankind and for the natural environment in conditions of the continuing existence and even growth of nuclear weapons?

One cannot but be amazed at the scientific and technological unscrupulousness of those who advocate the "star wars" program. If you really think about it, what its supporters are proposing is to throw to the winds of space that which is the common property of all mankind.

The Soviet Union is proposing a quite different, more real, hopeful, and more feasible path: to ban once and for all the whole class of space-strike armaments. We are not placing responsibility for this decision on the shoulders of future generations. We are taking it upon ourselves.

We know that the British Government attaches great significance to the problem of monitoring. We also agree that all agreements must be reliably checked. But let us look at the monitoring problems created by the "star wars" program. We have still not heard a word from our U.S. partners as to how it will be possible to carry out monitoring of the so-called "defensive armaments" they have begun to develop [sozdavat].

Where is the border line between defensive and offensive space armaments? Is there one in fact? How can one be sure that a space platform with missiles, lasers, and other technical means will not be used for a first strike? Perhaps our partners will be prepared in this event for an on-site inspection, i.e. in space?

There is, for example, the monitoring of authorized and unauthorized activity as stipulated by the ABM Treaty. We have spoken in favor of open familiarization with the activity of the appropriate laboratories.

With accords in any field, be it nuclear, space, or conventional weapons, the monitoring procedures will directly affect Britain. We hope that the British leadership, the British Government, which is stressing the importance of monitoring so much, will set an example of openness.

During the talks we presented the question of setting up cooperation, including Britain, in the peaceful use of space in the interests of all states.

We think that the talks we have held with British representatives will be quite a good undertaking for the future and will create good prerequisites for continuing a productive dialogue that will serve the cause of peace and universal security, as well as the growth of trust and cooperation between East and West.

Our talks show, and I would like to especially stress this, that there are good possibilities for developing bilateral Soviet-British relations to the benefit of both sides. This concerns political dialogue, trade, economic, scientific, and technological ties, as well as cultural exchanges, and other spheres of bilateral relations.

Allow me to express our gratitude to the British Government, to Prime Minister M. Thatcher, Foreign secretary G. Howe, and to political and public figures for the interest they have shown, for conducting the talks in an interested manner, and for the hospitality shown to us here.

E.A. Shevardnadze then answered numerous questions from correspondents. Regarding the prospects for a Soviet-U.S. summit, he said: This topic has been discussed at the talks in London. We agreed that such a meeting must be crowned with concrete results, especially regarding strengthening security and disarmament. There is an understanding on the British side that concrete accords are needed at this meeting.

Recently, the Soviet side made concrete proposals at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva on all three aspects of the talks. They create a basis for an accord on an essential reduction of strategic offensive weapons in the conditions of strengthening the ABM Treaty. As far as medium-range missiles are concerned, the USSR also proposed a possible draft agreement in this respect. In a word, it is our belief that it is possible to find acceptable variants to all these problems. But, not having an answer from the U.S., it is difficult for me to add anything to what has been said.

In answering the question as to whether the Soviet side appealed to the British government to use its channels to bring pressure on Washington, E.A. Shevardnadze said: We believe that the British side should not stand aloof from [ne dolzhna ostavatsya v storone ot] the process of resolving problems of strengthening security, halting the arms race, the nondeployment of [nerazmeshchiniye] space weapons and other important questions. We have the impression that the British side is ready to become more actively involved in this process.

A number of questions asked by journalists concerned the role and place of the British nuclear potential in resolving the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. E.A. Shevardnadze, in particular, noted: The USSR's position on this is well-known. The Soviet leadership is in favor of setting up a dialogue between the USSR and Britain on the question of that country's nuclear forces in the overall complex of nuclear problems. In conditions of a reduction of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe we consider it normal to raise the question on the quantitative non-build-up of the British nuclear arsenal. Apart from that, the United States should not hand over its nuclear weapons to other countries.

Answering corresponding questions, E.A. Shevardnadze said that the invitation to M. Thatcher to visit Moscow at an agreed time means that the dialogue between leaders of our two countries which began in 1984 during the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher will be continued.

That was a good beginning and the prime minister's visit to the USSR will be its useful continuation and will allow the prime minister of Great Britain to learn more about the life of the Soviet people and the Soviet state.

E.A. Shevardnadze answered other correspondents' questions.

Departs London 16 July

LD161150 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] London July 16 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, who was on an official visit here at the invitation of the British Government, has left London for Moscow today.

Before the departure Eduard Shevardnadze met and talked with British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe. Talking part in the meeting was USSR Ambassador to Britain Leonid Zamyatin.

Arrives in Moscow

LD161544 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1527 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jul (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, returned to Moscow from London today. He had been on an official visit to Britain at the invitation of the British Government.

At the airport he was met by Geydar Aliyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

SOKOLOV VISITS FINNISH AIR FORCE UNIT

LD162218 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] The official visit to Finland by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, is taking place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. Today the Soviet guest visited one of the aviation units of Finland's Air Force. He looked at the modern aviation technology and was present during demonstration flights. Later the same day Comrade Sokolov visited the training minelayer ship Pohjanmaa, where he was acquainted with the combat training of sailors and watched demonstration exercises by ships of Finland's Navy.

ORLOV-LED DELEGATION ENDS VISIT TO TURKEY

LD161838 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Istanbul July 16 TASS -- A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Vice President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Vladimir Orlov, ended its official visit to the Republic of Turkey.

The delegation left for home today. At the international Istanbul airport the delegation was seen off by Istanbul Governor N. Ayaz, other officials. Ambassador of the USSR in Turkey Vladimir Lavrov was among the seeing-off party.

Met by Tolkunov Upon Arrival

LD170832 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 17 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 17 TASS -- A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Vladimir Orlov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet returned to Moscow from Ankara on July 16. It paid an official visit to Turkey at the invitation of the Grand National Assembly of that country.

At the airport the delegation was met by Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other officials.

GORBACHEV MESSAGE GIVEN TO NETHERLANDS MINISTER

LD161733 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] The Hague July 16 TASS -- Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Vladimir Petrovskiy, now on an official working visit here, today handed over to Foreign Minister of the Netherlands Hans van den Broek a personal message to the Prime Minister of the Netherlands Rudolph Lubbers From General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. Problems of disarmament and limitation of armaments, and also questions of mutual interest, were discussed during the talk.

The Soviet representative held at the Foreign Ministry of the Netherlands consultations on the problems of international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space and items on the agenda of the coming 41st session of the U.N. General Assembly. The two sides agreed on expanding bilateral political consultations.

USSR Ambassador in the Netherlands Anatoliy Blatov took part in the talk and the consultations.

MITTERRAND'S APPRECIATION FOR GORBACHEV TALKS NOTED

LD141509 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] Paris July 14 TASS -- In an interview with the French television President Francois Mitterrand of France has expressed high appreciation of the talks with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev held in Moscow.

He pointed out that during the conversations with the Soviet leader and talks with the Soviet delegation the sides had centred their attention on questions connected with ensuring peace and security.

Today, when enormous amounts of weapons have been accumulated, disarmament problems are especially topical. France believes that the two great powers should put an end to the arms race and to achieve a substantial arms reduction.

According to President Mitterrand, problems of ensuring peace and security were also in the centre of the talks with U.S. President Ronald Reagan held in New York.

SUPREME SOVIET GREETS MITTERRAND ON BASTILLE DAY

PM141541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jul 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic:

On the occasion of Bastille Day, France's national holiday, we send to you, Mr President, and to the friendly French people sincere congratulations and best wishes.

The recent fruitful Soviet-French talks in Moscow showed with renewed force that at the present, crucial time the dialogue, mutual understanding, and cooperation between our countries are acquiring even greater significance as a factor for improving the international situation, accelerating detente, advancing all-European progress [as published], and strengthening security in Europe and all over the world.

[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

FRENCH CONSULTATIONS SHOW COMMON GOALS

LD162212 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1730 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Boris Tumanov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, good evening. It is absolutely true that France has not budged from its square on the world chess-board after the recent visit by President Francois Mitterrand to the USSR. Neither did the Soviet Union. This precision would have been totally useless had it not been for the strange mania of certain kill-joys in the West to interpret as an act of treason to the Western community any goodwill move by a Western leader toward the Soviet Union. Let them be reassured: Neither France nor the USSR has changed alliances.

However, there are certain Western observers who adopt disillusioned attitudes: If it is like that, they say, if the Mitterrand-Gorbachev encounter has led to no sensational result, if after the visit only things as untangible as the atmosphere and climate are mentioned, then what was the precise use of the French president's trip to Moscow, and above all, at a time when the political situation in France is very precarious and uncertain?

Well, without falling into didactism, I will try to explain what we in the USSR think of the practical results of President Mitterrand's visit to our country. First of all, and I think that this is most important: We better understand France and its political philosophy. At the same time, we have made ourselves better understood by France. We have been anxious, and it seems to me that we succeeded, in confirming not only the privileged character of Soviet-French relations among several sectors of our external policy, but also the importance we attach to the role played by France on the international scene.

President Mitterrand's visit was for us an occasion and a duty to point out the potentials of a European dialogue as a strategic factor of international security. Then, once again, it was possible for us to underline the complementary character of the two Europes which, quite naturally, tend toward one Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

It is without bitterness and disappointment that we have noted the existence of several objective and subjective factors that divide France and USSR, but it is with hope and confidence that we have noted in the eminent representative of France the same desire to stop the arms race, to purge the situation in Europe, and to cooperate with us in this direction.

When people have the same aims, the same objectives, they can always reach an understanding on the ways to attain them. It suffices not to break dialogue and to show goodwill.

True, all this fits badly with [words indistinct] of anti-Soviet cliches, but I have no illusions: in France or elsewhere, the incorrigible will continue, despite all, to talk nonsense about Russian tanks in Paris the day after tomorrow. So be it, [words indistinct] to be really dangerous. What [word indistinct] to preoccupy us really is, in my view, this insistence with which certain circles in France continue to justify the political aimlessness of Western Europe. Francois Mitterrand said in Moscow, I quote: Europe must really become once again the leading protagonist of its own history, and be able to play fully its role of a factor of balance and stability in international relations.

In Moscow, this idea is entirely shared, and this is sufficient to compromise it in the eyes of LE FIGARO which sees in this Soviet position a dangerous intention of the Soviet Union to separate Western Europe from the United States. Well, so far nothing has made us suppose that West European political leaders are inexperienced twits. The (?remark) by LE FIGARO indicates however that in certain French circles, there has been an exaggerated tendency to present the political men of Western European as children unable to keep even their pacifier. Now then, the French should squarely vote for Reagan in order at last to assuage the fears of LE FIGARO.

PRAVDA REPORTS U.S.-SPANISH TALKS ON BASES

PM160803 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Chernyshev dispatch: "No Concessions From Washington"]

[Text] Madrid, 12 Jul -- After 9 hours of intensive discussions, the Spanish and U.S. delegations agreed to regard the talks on the reduction of the U.S. military presence in Spain as part of the preliminary consultations on the extension of the bilateral treaty "of friendship and cooperation" which expires in May of 1988.

Prior to this meeting Madrid claimed that the question of the reduction of U.S. Armed Forces stationed at military bases in Spain had nothing in common with the treaty and had to be discussed as a separate issue in the relations between the two countries. The Spanish Government proceeded from an obligation it adopted as one of the preconditions of Spain's continued membership in NATO. However, Washington was in no mood to enter into negotiations about such a -- from its viewpoint -- sensitive problem and tried to have it included in the long list of issues to be discussed in connection with preparations for extending the treaty.

At the present meeting the U.S. delegation refused to give an inch, and Spain was forced to concur. The concrete result of the present meeting in Madrid is a commitment adopted by the United States to replace 10 percent of its servicemen stationed at the Torrejon de Ardoz Air Force Base near Madrid with civilian, "mainly Spanish," staff.

In the opinion of left-wing organizations that favor the complete withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Spain and the abrogation of the treaty between the two countries, the planned reduction is nothing but an attempt on Washington's part to create the impression that, allegedly, it is prepared "in the future" to meet Madrid's demands halfway. In other words, it is a question of reassuring public opinion in Spain, without making any changes worth mentioning.

The sides have agreed to continue their contacts in Washington in early October.

GREEK REJECTION OF U.S. ARMS UPGRADING ASSESSED

PM151031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Second Edition p 5

[Nikolay Miroshnik "Commentator's Column": "Against Nuclear Arsenals"]

[Text] The Greek Government has refused the U.S. request to permit the modernization of stockpiles of American nuclear weapons located on its territory. An official spokesman for Athens announced that this decision has been taken in connection with the government's intention to clear nuclear arsenals from the country's territory.

Let us note that this intention is already being put into practice: In October of last year the American Honest John missiles were removed from northern Greece. Thus the present Greek leadership, actively supporting the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans, is aware that the existence on the country's territory of weapons of mass destruction, which in effect it does not control, makes the country a U.S. nuclear hostage, a fact the people will not tolerate.

There are many such hostages on the Pentagon's lists, especially in Western Europe, where the territories of certain of the NATO allies are literally crammed with various kinds of American nuclear weapons. THE WASHINGTON POST, citing U.S. Congress documents, has just reported, for instance, the existence of 20 military bases where American fighter-bombers carrying nuclear weapons are stationed in a state of around-the-clock combat readiness. Fourteen of these bases are in Western Europe. Thus all it takes is a command from across the ocean -- and who can give an absolute guarantee that such a command will not be sent as a result of an erroneous assessment, or maliciously? -- and in a few minutes, nuclear death could be launched from the territory of, say, the FRG or Italy, whether they like it or not. However much the United States may try to reassure its allies by talking about the "dual key" and joint control over the atom bombs and missiles deployed in Western Europe, in effect it is only the Pentagon's finger on the launch button.

The way out of this alarming situation is to rid the Old World of the nuclear arsenals imposed on it, to create nuclear-free zones here, and ultimately to turn all of Europe into a zone without weapons of mass destruction. As is known, the Soviet Union, putting forward a whole package of constructive initiatives aimed at achieving these goals, has taken on a commitment never to use nuclear weapons against states that do not have such weapons on their territory.

To rid Europe of nuclear arsenals is a realistic task today. Only one thing is needed: for the leaders of the continent's countries to heed the demands of their own peoples, who are coming out increasingly resolutely against the threat of war.

FRG'S ASSISTANCE TO AFGHAN REBELS CRITICIZED

LD152022 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Mohammad Khan Junejo, prime minister of Pakistan, has paid an official visit to West Germany where he held talks with Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

The FRG chancellor expressed 'regret' over the fact that the 'Afghan problem' has not been settled yet. Indeed, it is a fact that the problem has not been settled so far. However, it is worthwhile to make it clear who is to blame for this state of things.

H. Kohl did not say point-blank who is responsible for the existing situation, while it is common knowledge that the problem in question is the direct result of the undeclared war unleashed against Afghanistan by the United States and its secret services.

It is Washington which is allocating enormous sums of money for the training of mercenary gangs and is supplying them with arms. Bonn is also adding fuel to the fire. According to press reports, various West German institutions and "funds" have already allocated for Pakistan 350 million marks and promised to allocate another 150 million marks this year, a major part of which will go for the assistance to Afghan counterrevolutionaries. The "Voice of Free Afghanistan" broadcasting station created in West Germany is taking an active part in the subversive activities against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

H. Kohl expressed "concern" over the fate of Afghan refugees and promised to further render them all-round assistance. However, it is common knowledge that the 'humanitarian aid' to the refugees is only a pretext under which certain FRG circles which are going along with the U.S. policy are actually financing the counterrevolutionary gangs.

It is worth recalling that the Government of Afghanistan consistently shows its humane attitude with regard to the Afghan people who were duped by the hostile propaganda. In accordance with the amnesty decree of the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of Afghanistan, the Afghan people who return home are given plots of land, farm implements, sowing grain, food and cattle. All the conditions are being created for them to take part in the building of a new life.

It is clear that certain circles in the West, including West Germany, are not interested in the solution of the 'refugees problem'. On the contrary, they are kindling this problem and are spreading all kinds of inventions with a view to heightening tension and putting up ever more obstacles on the way to a complete settlement of the Afghan problem.

BRIEFS

SPORTS COOPERATION WITH MALTA -- Moscow July 15 TASS -- Sports organisations of the USSR and Malta now have an agreement on principles of cooperation. It was signed here today by the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Sport Marat Gramov and Minister of Work, Housing and Sport of Malta Lorry Sant. This is the first ever agreement that places sports ties between the two countries on a juridical basis. Spanning a period of five years, the agreement provides for already this year joint tennis competitions and the sending of Soviet coaches in a number of sports to Malta. [Excerpt] [Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 15 Jul 86 LD]

NIGERIAN DELEGATION MEETS WITH RYZHKOV, ARKHIPOV

Talk With Ryzhkov

LD161840 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin today Okoh Ebitu Ukiwe, member of the Ruling Council of the Nigerian Armed Forces and head of the General Staff, who is heading a Nigerian Government delegation.

During the conversation, held in a friendly atmosphere, the sides discussed questions of bilateral cooperation and the present-day international situation.

The sides stated with satisfaction that relations between the Soviet Union and Nigeria were stable and mutually beneficial. Meeting the interests of the Soviet and the Nigerian peoples and serving the cause of peace and progress.

It was noted that good conditions were created through concerted effort for developing fruitful cooperation in the political, economic, cultural and other spheres.

In exchanging opinions on the most topical international problems, the sides stressed the need for invigorating the struggle conducted by all peace-loving forces and nations to prevent nuclear war and end the arms race, to achieve a radical turn in international affairs from confrontation to peaceful cooperation and coexistence.

Ebitu Ukiwe said that the efforts by the Soviet leadership, by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in defence of universal peace were highly appreciated in Nigeria. Nigeria would continue to support the Soviet initiatives directed at improving the international situation and ending the arms race.

Nigeria was thankful to the Soviet Union, he said, for its support to the national liberation movement in Africa and the African peoples' struggle against racism and apartheid, for freedom and independent development.

The sides pointed to the usefulness and fruitfulness of the current Moscow talks on questions of continuing cooperation in building the iron and steel works in Ajaokuta, and expressed the view that they would promote bilateral economic ties, friendship and all-round cooperation between the peoples of the two countries.

Arkhipov Meeting

LD161842 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- Talks were held today between Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Okoh Ebitu Ukiwe, member of the Ruling Council of the Armed Forces of Nigeria, chief of the General Staff.

During the talks which were held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, there was a detailed exchange of views on matters pertaining to the development of bilateral relations and some topical international problems.

Focussing attention on matters of Soviet-Nigerian economic and technical cooperation, the sides expressed satisfaction with its present level, pointing out at the same time the existing possibilities for broadening and deepening mutually beneficial ties in various fields.

It was emphasized that the construction of a steel mill in Ajaokuta with the technical assistance of the USSR would promote the growth of Nigeria's industrial potential and the strengthening of its economy.

The sides pointed out that positive development of relations and contacts between the Soviet Union and Nigeria in various spheres made it possible to appraise with optimism the future of bilateral relations and jointly to look for and consider new areas for mutually beneficial cooperation.

MALI PRESIDENT VISITS VOLGOGRAD, ASHKHABAD

LD162157 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moussa Traore, general secretary of the Mali People's Democratic Union and president of the Republic of Mali, and his wife today visited the hero city on the Volga. They looked around the memorial to the heroes of the battle of Stalingrad at Mamayev Kurgan. Flowers were laid at the eternal flame in the memorial's Hall of Servicemen's Glory. The guests also visited the Volgograd tractor works and the Volga hydropower station named in honor of the 22d CPSU Congress. In the afternoon Traore and his wife arrived in Ashkhabad from Volgograd.

COMMUNIQUE MARKS BRAZILIAN PARLIAMENTARIANS' VISIT

LD161343 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- The communique on the official visit to the USSR by a delegation from Brazil's National Congress, led by its chairman Jose Fragelli, points to the need for ending the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and looking for mutually acceptable solutions to other universal problems in the present-day world.

The delegation stayed in the Soviet Union from July 7 to 15 at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

During talks with Soviet parliamentarians, held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, the sides stressed the need for a new approach to the solution of global problems in the nuclear age.

The Soviet and the Brazilian parliamentarians pointed to the prime importance of the immediate termination of nuclear weapon tests, and favoured the development of international cooperation in preventing an arms race in outer space and in exploring space for peaceful purposes, and establishing international safeguards in nuclear engineering.

Expressing concern over the existence of tension and conflicts in various parts of the world, the parliamentarians from the two countries came out in support of the constructive efforts applied by Latin American countries to reach a fair political settlement in Central America on the basis of full respect for peoples' right to independent development and non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

They attached great importance to collective efforts to settle by political means the existing conflict situations in southern Africa, and the Near and Middle East, and strongly denounced any forms of terrorism, including state-sponsored terrorism.

The parliamentarians from the Soviet Union and Brazil observed that normalizing international economic relations, establishing equitable trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties between countries, the ties that are free from discrimination, and ensuring economic security of nations were acquiring special significance in the present-day international situation.

They came out in favour of establishing a new world economic order and starting global talks on the most important international financial and economic problems, including the debt problems.

The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the members of the Brazilian National Congress favoured further development of Soviet-Brazilian cooperation in the interests of the peoples of the two countries.

NEW TIMES CONDUCTS INTERVIEW WITH NICARAGUA'S ORTEGA

LD161845 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- "Giving a rebuff to Washington's policy of military, economic and political terror, we have attained major successes which are not to be taken from us", said President Daniel Ortega of the Republic of Nicaragua in an interview to the NEW TIMES correspondent on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Nicaraguan revolution. The interview is printed in the weekly's 29th issue.

"The U.S. plans to destroy the revolution have suffered and will suffer a fiasco. And this is the greatest victory of our people", stressed Daniel Ortega.

Meanwhile one cannot but see that a grave damage was inflicted on our social and economic programmes. The accomplishments of the first years of the revolution, the lives of Nicaraguans are imperiled every day. People are perishing. We should exert strenuous efforts to survive, to maintain the education and public health systems at the existing level, let alone their expansion, said the Nicaraguan leader.

Drafting the constitution is politically very important to us, said the president of Nicaragua. The United States naturally does not want us to have our own constitution, it does not want the revolutionary process to be substantiated legally, and is doing its utmost to prevent that.

We have information at our disposal on how the U.S. Embassy in trying to influence the political parties represented at the National Assembly to convince them to stay away from discussing the draft constitution. Washington wants the Sandinist National Liberation Front to do that alone. We decided to adopt the constitution, cost what it may -- either with the participation of the political parties or without them. This is a great battle, and we hope to win it, notwithstanding the U.S. counteraction.

We have internal reserves. but we also rest on support of internationalist political and economic solidarity, and especially on support of the Soviet Union, with its people rendering fraternal assistance to the Nicaraguan people, stressed Daniel Ortega.

U.S. BARS CUBAN SCIENTISTS FROM HONOLULU MEETING

LD110847 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Text] Havana July 11 TASS -- The U.S. State Department refused to issue entry visas to a group of Cuban scientists invited to the 18th International Congress of Pediatrists in Honolulu. Enzo Duenas, vice-president of the Latin American Pediatrics Association, who was to head the Cuban delegation at this scientific forum, told PRENSA LATINA that the obstacles erected to the Cuban scientists are a new hostile action on the part of the U.S. authorities which make attempts to bar Cuba from demonstrating for another time its achievements in the field of medicine and, especially, in pediatrics.

SHALAYEV REPORTS TO 11TH AUCCTU PLENUM

PM161403 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Jul 86 p 1

["Abbreviated account" of report by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev at 4 July 11th AUCCTU Plenum: "Important Stage in Trade Union Life"]

[Text] In accordance with the USSR Trade Union Statutes, the beginning of next year is the time to convene the next congress of the country's trade unions.

Before the congress it is necessary to give reports and hold elections in all trade union organs and also to carry out great organizational work on the preparations for that important event and on the trade unions' practical implementation of the tasks stemming from the 27th party congress decisions. Therefore the AUCCTU presidium considers it necessary to adopt a corresponding decision in good time and submits for consideration by the plenum a proposal to convene the 18th USSR Trade Union Congress 24 February 1987 with the following agenda:

1. Report on the AUCCTU's work and the trade unions' tasks in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

2. Report of the Central Auditing Commission.

3. On amendments to the USSR Trade Union Statutes.

4. Elections of the AUCCTU.

5. Elections to the Central Auditing Commission.

The preparations for the 18th USSR Trade Union Congress and the report and election campaign preceding it will take place in a situation when, at the will of the Communist Party, many aspects of the life of Soviet society are being decisively updated. As was emphasized at the party Central Committee June (1986) Plenum, following the 27th CPSU Congress Soviet society has bestirred itself in all spheres -- political, economic, spiritual. Social development has received a powerful dynamic charge, which has led to a surge of political self-awareness among the masses. The atmosphere of demandingness, exactingness, and justice which prevailed at the congress is having a mobilizing effect on all practical deeds.

The positive processes taking place in society and the Soviet people's active labor have ensured an increase in the pace of the national economy's development.

Emphasizing that it is particularly important now to consolidate our hold on the growth rates achieved and to increase them further, the CPSU Central Committee plenum pointed out to the need to advance more quickly along the path outlined by the party, resolutely overcome negative phenomena in the economy's development, and energetically support everything healthy and everything that corresponds to the decisions of the party congress and that really signifies reorganization and progress.

The CPSU Central Committee has appealed to the Soviet Union's working people to widely mount nationwide socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of the 12th 5-Year Plan targets and to turn bold plans and schemes into the energy of practical actions.

The appeal has elicited a warm response. Labor collectives everywhere are seeking opportunities to improve their work and to successfully fulfill the current year's plan and the 12th 5-Year Plan targets and are multiplying labor initiatives in order to produce better than before, more cheaply than before, and more than before.

An important role is allocated to the trade unions in the tremendous organizational work being done by the party and the people to implement the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

The trade unions have recently increased their attention to socialist competition and to solving social problems. Shortcomings and omissions in work have begun to be exposed more decisively, and the state of affairs has begun to be assessed more objectively. Many rational and businesslike proposals are advanced on how to rid ourselves better and more quickly of obsolete stereotypes.

But these are just the first steps. And far from all trade union organs have taken them. The previous AUCCTU plenum conducted a comprehensive discussion of the trade unions' tasks stemming from the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. It discussed the cardinal reorganization and improvement of all trade union work and bringing it fully into line with the party's strategic policy of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development.

Unfortunately, we are advancing too slowly in this direction, and for many trade union leaders the new approach to work still remains just a slogan.

It is necessary to increase the trade unions' impact on the economy's development, enhance their activeness in general work on intensifying and enhancing the efficiency of production and improving the economic mechanism, implement the party's social policy in a more resolute and principled manner, and assert a dynamic style in keeping with the spirit of the time and with the trade unions' democratic nature.

The reports and elections of trade union organs and all the preparations for the trade union congress must take place under the sign of mobilizing working people to successfully fulfill the 27th CPSU Congress decisions and the targets for 1986 and the 12th 5-Year Plan as a whole and have a proper impact on improving the trade unions' work in the economic, social, cultural, and sociopolitical spheres.

The speaker briefly described the trade unions' tasks in mounting the nationwide socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of the 12th 5-Year Plan targets, pointing out that this question will be examined more widely in accordance with the plenum agenda.

The 10th AUCCTU plenum emphasized the need to activate the trade unions' role in accelerating scientific and technical progress, retooling and updating production, and strengthening ties between science and production. During the preparations for the trade union congress those instructions must be implemented in the practice of trade union work at all levels. At the report and election meetings of the trade union organizations of scientific research and planning institutes and VUZes it is necessary to define measures to resolutely strengthen these organizations' role in the struggle to enhance the efficiency of the work of creative collectives of scientists and to draw science closer to production.

The "public sector of science" can and must increase its contribution to scientific and technical progress. We await from our scientific and technical society and All-Union Inventors and Rationalizers Society organizations very active and specific measures to develop the working people's mass technical creativity.

Trade union committees and trade unions as a whole are now faced with special tasks in connection with the fact that, as of 1987, all industrial sectors, agriculture, construction, trade, transport, and communications are to start working under the new management conditions.

Very great preparatory work must be done to ensure that the huge potential of the reserves for improving economic efficiency contained in the new economic mechanism is realized. We have spoken repeatedly of the need for the active participation of trade union organizations in this preparatory work, including at the previous AUCCTU plenum. However, it has to be frankly stated that the proper reorganization has not yet taken place here either. A formal, bureaucratic approach to work on transferring enterprises to the new management conditions is being permitted. The preparation of labor collectives to work under the new conditions and the first experience of managing in the new way must be examined at the report and election meetings and conferences of primary trade union organizations and be under the constant control of trade union oblast and kray committees and all leading trade union organs.

The speaker emphasized that the upcoming trade union congress will assess the work of the AUCCTU and of trade union central committees and councils, above all, by their specific contribution to developing the economy. Therefore, the time remaining before the congress must be fully utilized by every organization to increase this contribution and to make it worthy of the trade unions' position and role in our society.

Guided by the 27th CPSU Congress instruction that social policy and the working people's interests must always be uppermost in the trade unions' minds, it is necessary to increase the attention of primary organizations, trade union committees, and the AUCCTU to questions of improving working conditions and labor safety procedures, preventing and reducing sickness, creating a proper production routine, fulfilling the Food Program, expanding the production and improving the quality of consumer goods, and constructing housing and children's preschool and other social and consumer establishments, and to questions of organizing trade, public catering, and consumer services.

There are specific aims and targets in this work which must be achieved this year and tasks which must be accomplished before the 18th Trade Union Congress. Above all, thorough preparatory work connected with the introduction of new wage rates and salaries must be done. The maximum possible must be done before the trade union congress to improve working conditions and further reduce industrial injuries and sickness. It is particularly important to secure a reduction in the volumes of heavy and labor-intensive work done manually, to provide all workers with sanitary facilities and service premises in accordance with the norms and with good-quality protective clothing, and to increase concern for women workers.

Sectorial comprehensive plans relationg to labor safety procedures for the 12th 5-Year Plan must be reworked as quickly as possible by trade union central committees and ministries and brought fully into line with the task advanced by the party congress of achieving fundamental changes in the labor sphere over the next few years.

The 27th CPSU Congress set a task of historic social significance -- to provide every Soviet family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000.

On the initiative of trade union committees and taking into account the development prospects of their own production facilities, the labor collectives of a number of enterprises have determined specific measures aimed at accelerating the performance of the task of fully providing all their working people with housing.

Thus, the collective of the Gorkiy Motor Vehicle Plant has set the task of providing every family with a separate well-appointed apartment by 1995. To this end it has been decided to double the volume of housing construction, using the plant's own resources, to channel toward these ends more than half the assets of the sociocultural measures and housing construction fund, and to give all possible assistance to construction organizations, including by providing manpower.

The collectives of a number of enterprises in Kemerovo, Dnepropetrovsk, and Chelyabinsk Oblasts and Maritime Kray have advanced a similar initiative. There is good experience of drawing up territorial programs to accelerate the solution of the housing problem with the active participation of trade union councils -- in Ulyanovsk Oblast, for example.

Taking this experience into account, trade union councils and committees are advised to carry out the necessary organizational work, so that similar measures are determined for every enterprise, association,and sector and for every oblast, kray, and republic.

Trade union central committees and councils are obliged, together with ministries and union republic councils of ministers, to examine the progress in fulfilling this year's construction plans for housing and social projects and to take specific measures to ensure not only their fulfillment but also their overfulfillment.

During the reports and elections and the preparations for the trade union congress it is necessary to activate in every possible way the participation of trade union organization in implementing the party's agrarian policy and realizing the Food Program.

It should be taken into account that this will be the first report and election campaign in the newly formed trade union of workers in the agro-industrial complex -- the largest in the country. It will be carried out directly after the completion of the creation of new organs of management of the agro-industrial complex at the center and locally, at the initial stage of introducing the new economic machinery of management in its sectors.

The attention of the participants in the report and election meetings and conferences, of all labor collectives, and of this trade union's organizations must be focused on specific measures to improve the country's food supply by intensifying agricultural production, making better use of material and technical resources, introducing the collective contract and real financial autonomy, and sharply reducing product losses during the storage and processing of agricultural raw materials.

The most immediate task of this trade union with more than 37 million members is to greet its first congress by successfully completing the first agricultural year of the 12th 5-Year Plan and creating the necessary conditions for further increasing production of livestock products in the coming winter period.

Concern for the social reorganization of the countryside and for improving trade, consumer, medical, and cultural services for the rural population must also be uppermost in the minds of trade union committees operating in the system of the agro-industrial complex.

It is necessary to activate joint work with economic organs on implementing the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Consumer Goods and the Services Sphere and to ensure this year an increase of 245,000 places in workers' dining rooms and the opening of 1,150 new stores and departments and consumer service centers close to production.
[paragraph continues]

This year all trade union rest establishments are to go over to organizing family vacations. The scale of tourism organized along trade union lines is increasing significantly.

In showing concern for satisfying working people's material requirements, trade union committees are obliged to be guided strictly by the principle of social justice. Whether it is a question of raising wage rates and salaries, awarding bonuses, distributing apartments, or allocating travel passes and other benefits from social consumption funds, in all cases the principle of social justice must not be violated, and trade unions, too, are responsible for this before the party and the people.

It is perfectly obvious that during the preparations for the trade union congress and during the reports and elections at all levels it is necessary also to lay stress on stepping up the educational work of trade union organizations, strengthening labor discipline, and eradicating drunkenness.

All forms of this work and, of course, above all, education in labor, in labor collectives, and also at places of residence, the raising of cultural and technical standards, the organization of meaningful leisure for working people and their families, and the better utilization of cultural-educational and sports establishments must be subjected to exacting analysis.

Reports and elections and all preparations for the trade union congress must be used to the maximum to raise the standard of all mass organizational work, to improve its style, and to increase results.

It is the common task both of the AUCCTU and of trade union central committees and councils to hold report and election meetings and conferences at a high organizational and political level, in strict accordance with the USSR Trade Union Statutes and the requirements of the Instruction on Holding Elections to Trade Union Organs, but without overregimentation. At meetings and conferences it is necessary to create an atmosphere of broad, free, and frank exchange of opinions and comradely criticism and self-criticism and to ensure the participation of leaders and responsible workers of ministries and departments, the prompt consideration of critical remarks and suggestions, and the timely adoption of the necessary measures relating to them.

The attention of meeting and conference particpants must be concentrated on enhancing the activeness of trade union organizations, on weak aspects of their activity, on instances of insufficient businesslike efficiency, uncriticial assessment of the results achieved, and unscrupulousness in relations with economic leaders, when concern is not shown for people and their labor rights are violated.

Everything that leads away from lively work -- creation of paperwork, a passion for holding meetings, overregimentation -- must be subjected to resolute condemnation.

We are obliged to show concern to ensure that really worthy trade union members -- workers and kolkhoz members, sector specialists, women, young people, and representatives of different nationalities, capable of performing tasks in accordance with the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress by virtue of their political and moral qualities and business qualifications -- are nominated for elected trade union organs. The elected trade union aktiv, numbering almost 16 million people, is a great school for involving people in management, and new, increasingly broad masses of working people must pass through it at an increasingly high level of trade union organizational and educational work.

We are obliged to devote constant attention to questions of further improving the trade unions' structure so as to ensure that it fully accords with the production principle.

Certain operational measures are required in connection with the transfer of national economic sectors to a two-tier management system and the creation of new science-and-production associations and intersectorial scientific sectors.

Taking into account the new edition of the Program and Statutes approved by the 27th party congress and the Law on Labor Collectives, the need arises for corresponding amendments in the Trade Union Statutes. Analogous work with the sector statutes must also be done by trade union central committees.

Thus, the reports and elections and the preparations for the trade union congress are to be an important new step in the development of trade union democracy and socialist democracy in general -- without which, as was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress, the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development is inconceivable and impossible.

Comrade Shalayev expressed confidence that the preparatory work for the congress will be carried out in an organized manner and to a high standard. Guided by the ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress and the party's instructions, we will arrive at the next USSR trade union congress with a clear-cut action program for Soviet trade unions -- a program well verified in practice and enriched with progressive experience of reorganization, a program of their practical participation in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and in the struggle to broaden and strengthen international cooperation in the interests of peace and social progress.

PRACTICES OF KIRGHIZ WRITERS UNION CRITICIZED

PM161235 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 86 p 7

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Samoylenko article under the rubric "In the Country's Writers' Organizations": "Alienation: Unprecedented Reportage from the Kirghiz Writers Union"]

[Text] Frunze -- On the surface, the situation following the Seventh Kirghiz Writers Union Congress 5 years ago looked irreproachable: Literary figures worked fruitfully, their works were being published on a large scale, and they were fully determined to implement the tasks set by the congress. The Writers Union's activity was being extremely positively evaluated in the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and plans were in hand to build an apartment block for writers, to open a literary museum and a literary publishing house, to build a creativity center...

Five years went by... Having landed in Frunze, I decided to visit the theater, tour the literary museum, and call at the new literary publishing house before I had my conversations at the Writers Union about the life and work of the republican writers organization between its congresses.

I did not find any literary museum; it was nonexistent just like 5 years ago. Nor did I succeed in seeing any performances of the plays entitled "Long-Distance Train" [Poyezd Dalnego Sledovaniya] by M. Baydzhiyev, "The Night of the Divorce" [Noch Razvoda] by K. Akmatov, or "The Day Lasts Longer than a Century" [I Dolshe Veka Dlitsya Den] by Ch. Aytmatov -- they had been cancelled from the repertoire of republican theaters... The republic was still without a literary publishing house.

...That was a distressing time for us both. But Zh. Mamytov, secretary of the Kirghiz Writers Union Board, who was elected only a year ago at a Writers Union plenum, must have found it more difficult than I did. After all I was only asking the questions while he had to answer them.

Zholon Mamytovich told me what had happened at the Writers Union on the day before my arrival. While sorting out the heaps of paper left behind by T. Askarov, former first secretary of the Writers Union Board, his assistant came across six greeting messages, including one from the USSR Writers Union. All of them had been sent to T. Askarov 4 years ago for presentation to Kirghiz People's Writer T. Sydykbekov, winner of the USSR State Prize, on the occasion of his 70th birthday. But the first secretary "forgot" the greetings messages in his desk because the person celebrating the jubilee was not one of "his" people....

I recorded five tape cassettes in the course of my meetings with Writers Union officials and leading Kirghiz writers. These recordings contain indignation, grievances, and anguish for their writers organization.... And a passionate desire to establish a businesslike atmosphere within the Writers Union, to tackle at long last the acute problems which Kirghiz literature has been facing for a long time now. Virtually all of them spoke about a single issue -- about the web of "strage" events, appalling facts [ubiystvennyye fakty], and acutely irreconcilable relationships...which had been woven by Askarov and his "team."

However, let us begin at that time in the spring of 1981 when the famous Kirghiz prose writer T. Kasymbekov surprisingly started having frequent meetings with poet S. Maymulov. Tolegen Kasymbekovich had never, not even at party meetings, concealed his critical attitude toward T. Askarov's style of leadership and his manner of dealing with people. Nor did he make a secret of it in conversations with Maymulov.

Soon enough he was summoned by Askarov. The first secretary's "comrades in arms" were in the office, and so was... Maymulov who started reading from a notebook about what had been said where and to whom by Kasymbekov about Askarov. It emerged that "colossal work" had been done, and that Maymulov's "file" contained dozens of writers' surnames, listing against each name details of what, where, and to whom...about Askarov.

By that time he had already been leading the Writers Union for 10 years. To be more precise, commanding it, having turned into the writers' boss. His high official positions (he was also chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet) and the fact that he was liked by high authority somehow elevated Askarov above the other writers and offered him reliable protection against criticism and the exacting attitude of his fellow writers. He developed a lack of concern and a dangerous sense of contentment. Had it not been for that, Tendik Askarovich would have definitely perceived his own dangerous internal contradiction (or the split of his own personality): The critic Askarov could not tolerate criticism. There was nothing reprehensible within the framework of his official influence: Achievements, flourishing, growth -- yes, indeed! But, by its very nature, the creative environment contains all kinds of problems, and they can be resolved only publicly, fully in accord with the principles of morals and democracy. But Askarov could not be bothered to maintain contacts with his colleagues on an equal footing. As soon as he detected any disagreement or someone's intention to express his own point of view, he immediately started applying pressure: "This is the Central Committee's opinion! Do I take it that you are against it?!" thus creating the impression that he was the only one guided by party interests.

This demagogic stance by the chief automatically turned his subordinates (this was indeed the role he had assigned to writers) into people who were supposedly ideologically immature and incapable of understanding something that was known only to him.... Having toured Naryn Oblast's Kochkorskiy Rayon, prose writer K. Saktanov, chief of the Current Affairs Section [otdel publitsistiki] of the journal ALA-TOO, wrote a feature in an attempt to present a socioeconomic picture of the rayon. The material contained stories about working people and good words about their successes and achievements. But the feature contained something else, too. The writer could not have failed to see that drunkenness, economic mismanagement, and abuses still existed in the rayon.... The journal's issue containing the feature was printed and... killed. The issue was later released, but no longer containing K. Saktanov's feature. Soon afterwards the author himself was dismissed from work "for political immaturity" (I quote from the order's wording), any blocking moves having been prevented in advance at a special session at the Kirghiz Writers Union at which T. Askarov and his "comrades in arms" accused the writer of passion for alien ideology, of dangerous thinking, of desiring to denigrate... what (or whom) did K. Saktanov denigrate? In order to understand this it is necessary to call everything by its proper name. The point is that Kochkorskiy Rayon is the homeland of T. Usubaliyev, former first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, and, in view of this, it was deemed impossible that either drunkenness or economic mismanagement could have existed in the rayon. This was the essence of T. Askarov's "Central Committee line" and writer K. Saktanov's "political immaturity." All this happened a few years ago (and all these years K. Saktanov lived with the label of an ideologically unreliable writer), and only now has an investigation been launched into this monstrous incident, an investigation which has revealed the people who were responsible. A by no means insignificant role in it was played in particular by B. Karagulov, member of the USSR Writers Union and chief of the republican Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press at the time.

Gradually, and without noticing it, Tendik Askarovich lost his healthy outlook on life and, in view of the fact that -- as the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress noted -- a spirit of unprincipledness and servility held sway in the republic, he was forced to grade writers according to this defective law. He became a small cog in a machine that was alien to a really civic-minded writer, and the drive belt of this machine started twisting him, crushing his will and principles, and destroying his literary talent.... Actually, Askarov did not object too much to the new turn his life was taking, and the role of being an intimate immediately started paying dividends -- awards, honorary posts, carte blanche to make a decision on any issue....

Tendik Askarovich did not forget those who had failed to pander to him, either. Having taken care of the congress, he descended upon the republic's leading writers who were simply removed from the Writers Union. That was the time when K. Akmatov's and M. Baydzhiyev's plays were deleted from the theatrical repertoire.... The local press carried devastating articles about their creative work.

Particular attention was given to Kasymbekov. Askarov prohibited publishing houses from publishing Tolegen Kasymbekovich's latest historical-revolutionary novel "Rebirth" [Vozrozhdeniye], twisted around his little finger all the commissions that turned up in response to letters from the writer, and then got hold of the manuscript copies and locked them up in his personal safe. For 2 years. That was the time when Kasymbekov, in desperation, applied to the court which, without any difficulty, ruled that the author's rights had been most crudely violated. But Tendik Askarovich, from the height of his position as chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet, pressured the court: If the novel is not to be published, let the author return the advance payment to the publishing house. A marshal of the court turned up at Kasymbekov's home to make an inventory of his property. Matters did not progress as far as confiscation; certain people managed to prevent it. And times were changing in the wake of the CPSU Central Committee plenum....

...A final proof copy of "Rebirth" lay on the table while T. Kasymbekov and I spoke about this preposterous incident, about the Writers Union's affairs, and about the fact that restructuring is finally under way within the republican writers organization and that much work remains to be done. Tolegen Kasymbekovich glanced at the book now and again. He had waited a long time for this moment -- 5 years! Written in 1981, the novel saw the light of day only 2 months ago.

That was how Askarov lived and worked, holding onto his seat in the narrow and, to put bluntly, rather stagnant small world of his titled confederates. And he did not notice how time was passing. He had produced no real books. Not in the mood for writing. He attributed that to official commitments and other seemingly proper reasons. But the reality was different. The fact was that the process of moral and civic decadence was actively under way. That was why he was no longer capable of creating something honest, something to meet the needs of literature and the readers. The question of the lack of personal creative ability loomed up before him in all its painful obviousness. And the way of thinking which had become normal for him made Askarov draw the simple conclusion: Arrange matters so that works by other, talented people are not published. Give free rein to mediocrity. Let titles and prizes go to the merely average. They are no competition. Against the background provided by them, he could remain outstanding for a long time, even without creating anything.

Meanwhile, the life of mainstream literature in the republic was taking its own course. Writers were traveling in the republic of their own accord and were discussing their urgent problems between themselves. And they were engaged in their main work -- writing books. Good books.

In May this year at the Kirghiz Writers Union Board plenum the republic's writers unanimously relieved T. Askarov from his duties as first secretary owing to shortcomings in work. He hastened to depart from within the Writers Union walls, moving on to other work, but the writers invited him to their party meeting. Leafing through the transcript (Askarov was severely reprimanded along party lines and had his service record endorsed), I read passages from the speeches by communist writers and thought to myself that this must have been a fateful day in Askarov's life. A day when he had to settle the account presented by literature, his fellow writers, and life itself. A day when truth triumphed, a day which could have restored the vision of a writer who had become entangled in affairs that were alien to real literature. [paragraph continues]

And I would have believed that the party meeting did have that effect on writer Askarov, had it not been for the ease with which he admitted all his mistakes and expressed readiness to abandon at once everything that had been the norm of his life and style of behavior in the past, a readiness to apologize to all and everyone, and his persistent pleas not to be judged too harshly, to be forgiven.... All this is indicative of yesterday's typical practice of liberal and indulgent attitudes, particularly toward everything that has provided the subject of these notes -- a practice which today is being decisively eradicated at all levels in the republic, including the writers circles. The time for accountability has come. For everyone. The time be held strictly to account....

K. Akmatov, T. Sydykbekov, and T. Kasymbekov were elected to the USSR Writers Union Board by the Eighth USSR Writers Congress. The Sovetskiy Pisatel Publishing House has plans to publish T. Kasymbekov's novel "Rebirth." Performances of plays by K. Akmatov and M. Baydzhiyev and of the dramatized version of Ch. Aytmatov's "And the Day Lasts Longer than a Century" are being included again in the repertoire of republican theaters. The Kirghiz Writers Union and the appropriate offices are examining the question of awarding honorary titles to literary figures who really deserve them. But the implementation of total justice requires not only the recognition of services by those who tolerated injustice and were involved in it.

Postscript. The above material was written back in May, but I did not submit it to the editorial office at that time; the Eighth Kirghiz Writers Congress was less than a month away, and it was important to see how the republic's literary figures would manage, without outside "interference," to analyze the situation prevailing within the writers organization, what conclusions they would draw, and how principled they would be in evaluating the guilt of those who, for years on end, implanted in the Kirghiz Writers Union the principles of authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership and created an atmosphere of mutual alienation and division into "us and them" in terms of personal loyalty and parochialism.... On the eve of the congress I spoke with Ch. Aytmatov, new chairman of the Kirghiz Writers Union Board, about the fact that too much time and effort had been wasted on petty intrigues only incidental to literature, on demagoguery, and cheap passions, and that the republican writers organization must restructure itself immediately and rise to a fundamentally different and qualitatively new level of organizational and creative activity.

To a large extent this did occur. For the first time in many years, in the opinion of the majority of Kirghiz writers, everything was called by its proper name: Mediocrity was called mediocrity and success -- success. At long last, really talented writers heard good words spoken about them; everything that had to be said was also said about the persons without talent who had tirelessly exploited literature as a source of personal benefits and all kinds of distinctions. Yes, much was done, indeed. But by no means everything. Those who essentially split the Kirghiz Writes Union from Kirghiz literature, who replaced accurate ideological and artistic criteria with personal and subjective evaluations, and who turned the writers organization into some kind of distribution center for "sticks" and "carrots," are still prospering.

Lessons must be learned from the past, moral and civic lessons, lessons for the future. It is for this purpose that I have written this reportage for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's traditional rubric "In the Country's Writers Organizations." A reportage that is, to put it bluntly, unprecedented.

PRAVDA REPORTS UKRAINIAN CP CC PLENUM

PM161349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinets report: "A Searching Look: From the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] A plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee held yesterday discussed the tasks of the republic's party organizations in fulfilling the decisions of the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR for 1986-1990. A report was delivered by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The republic's Communists and working people, the keynote speaker said, like all Soviet people, fully approve the decisions and documents of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The CPSU Central Committee appeal to launch more widely the nationwide socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of 5-year plan targets is meeting with a warm response among the republic's labor collectives.

The fulfillment of the 5-year plan, it was noted in the report and the debates, requires every party organization, every Communist, and all the working people to work purposefully, intensively, and creatively in all sectors of the national economy. In 6 months industrial output has increased by 5.5 percent against a target of 3.4 percent for the year. Above-plan sales of industrial output were R1.54 billion, and practically the entire increase was obtained through increased labor productivity. Milk and meat purchases have increased by 5-8 percent. More housing has been constructed than planned.

However, the economic restructuring is not taking place at the necessary pace everywhere. Certain ministries and departments and party and soviet organs in the republic are slow to get out of their rut. Today one in five enterprises fail to cope with contract commitments, and over the 6 months the shortfall was R455 million worth of output. The situation is particularly unfavorable in Zaporozhye Oblast. There are many contract violations at enterprises of the republic's Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, Ministry of the Timber and Wood Processing Industry, and Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry.

The deepening of the intensification of the economy, the speakers said, is the main key to the accomplishment of 5-year plan tasks. Much remains to be done to reorient investments and structural policy, improve the equipment shift index, and certify and rationalize jobs. The labor collectives of Kharkov Oblast have become actively involved in this work. The organization of two shifts will make it possible to release some 11,000 machine tools here.

Mention was made of the need to radically improve planning and design work. The following instance was cited. A number of large textile enterprises have been built in the Ukraine to the designs of the Kiev Institute of the Ministry of Light Industry, where M. Chayka is director. However, their plans were designed for obsolete equipment, and other miscalculations were made. Nearly one-fifth of the country's machine building potential is concentrated in the republic. It was noted that obsolete articles are still being produced in considerable quantities at the sector's enterprises.

Calling for an improvement in the final indicators of work, the plenum participants cited the high quality of output from the Kiev Machine Tool Building, Sumy Frunze, Zaporoshtransformator, and Carpathian Furniture Combine Production Associations. [paragraph continues]

At the same time it was pointed out that the initiators of the struggle for quality -- the people of Lvov -- are losing their position. In this indicator, Lvov Oblast now ranks 19th in the republic.

The question fo the state of capital construction was posed urgently at the plenum. More than 200 production capacities have been under construction for 10 years or more. It was proposed that the experience of Belorussian construction workers, which was discussed at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, be studied profoundly and utilized.

The course of acceleration in agriculture must find practical expression above all in an increase in the stability of grain production. By the end of the 5-year plan the republic must increase the gross grain harvest by 13-15 million metric tons, a 33-37 percent increase on the annual average for the last 5 years. The speakers stressed the need resolutely to step up the struggle against the dependent attitudes of certain leaders and proposed more active dissemination of Voroshilovgrad Oblast's experience, which was approved by the CPSU Central Committee. The value of the Voroshilovgrad initiative is that in increasing the output of food goods they rely on their own resources and internal reserves.

The plenum discussed in detail the course of operations to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident. Profound gratitude was expressed from the platform to the party, soviet, and economic organs and working people of Moscow, other cities and villages of the RSFSR, and all the union republics for the help and support and the fraternal feelings they displayed.

The plenum gave an important place to questions of party organizational and ideological work and turning it decisively toward people and real action. The first steps in this direction can already be seen. The activity of the Kiev, Donetsk, Sumy, and Kharkov party organizations on a number of questions was assessed positively at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. But that is only the start of the radical reorientation which life demands. The necessary changes have not yet been made in the work of many of the republic's party committees.

There was criticism of Vinnitsa and Rovno party obkoms, which were unforgivably tolerant toward workers who for years messed up the job entrusted to them and violated state discipline and the requirements of the CPSU Statutes. This attitude toward cadre education is seriously detrimental both to production and to the party organizations' prestige.

The times require an improvement in the work style of party committees, the eradication of the mania for meetings, and the establishment of a businesslike approach. At the same time, in a number of places people are still fond of holding large conferences on any pretext. In Khmelnitskiy Oblast, for instance, in the first quarter of this year some 9,000 people attended various oblast conferences, seminars, and scientific and pratctical conferences on agriculture alone. In Kamenets-Podolsk, in a month, there were 16 different mass events with the participation of 4,000 people, most of them on working days. With the tacit consent of the party obkom, many thousands of people are simply not being allowed to work. And the party and soviet apparatus, it was said from the plenum platform, sits around and writes checklists and reports instead of getting on with the job. In this connection there were serious complaints about V. Dikusarov, first securetary of Khmelnitskiy party obkom, as well as I. Grintsov and A. Korniyenko, first secretaries of Sumy and Ternopol obkoms.

All these shortcomings indicate, it was noted at the plenum, that Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee secretaries and sections, as well as inspectors, are doing poor work to study the state of affairs on the spot, and do not find out about such flagrant cases until late in the day, which means that they do not adopt the necessary measures in good time.

In the resolution adopted, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum assured the CPSU Central Committee that the Communists and all working people of the republic, inspired by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, will ensure the successful implementation of the tasks set by the 27th party congress and make a fitting contribution to the fulfillment of plans in the 12th 5-Year Plan.

LEADERSHIP SIGNS ACADEMICIAN MELENTYEV OBITUARY

PM161513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Second Edition p 6

[Obituary: "Academician Lev Aleksandrovich Melentyev"]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a great loss. Academician Lev Aleksandrovich Melentyev, an outstanding Soviet scientist in the sphere of energy, member of the CPSU, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences presidium, director of the Energy Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and Hero of Socialist Labor, died on 8 July 1986 at age of 77. [passage omitted] L.A. Melentyev's scientific activity was devoted to resolving the most complex and important problems of the country's fuel and energy complex and creating theoretical foundations for systematic research in energy. His name is associated with major achievements in the sphere of the optimization of the development of large energy systems. [passage omitted]

G.A. Aliyev, V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye. K. Ligachev, V.I. Dolgikh, B.N. Yeltsin, M.V. Zimyanin, A.P. Aleksandrov, G.I. Marchuk, B. Ye. Shcherbina, V.A. Kotelnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, Ye. P. Velikhov, V.A. Koptyug, A.A. Logunov, Yu. A. Ovchinnikov, K.V. Frolov, A.L. Yanshin, V.A. Grigoryev, G.K. Skryabin, V.M. Velichko, V.A. Dinkov, A.I. Mayorets, V.S. Chernomyrdin, M.I. Shchadov, V.A. Kirillin, I.A. Glebov, K.S. Demirchyan, M.A. Styrikovich, A. Ye. Sheyndlin, N.K. Baybakov, and A.A. Makarov.

GEORGIAN KOMSOMOL FIRST SECRETARY TRANSFERRED

LD161834 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol was held today. It discussed an organizational question. The plenum released Comrade Lordkipanidze from the duties of first secretary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of Georgia in connection with his transfer to party work. The plenum elected as first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol Comrade Margvelidze who previously worked as second secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee.

Comrade Patiashvili, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party, spoke at the plenum. Comrade (Sleptsov), head of the Scientific Youth Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol took part in the work of the plenum.

CPSU CC DISCUSSES 1986 ECONOMIC PROGRESS

LD161738 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Report entitled: "In the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has examined the question of the results of the development of the country's economy during the first 6 months of 1986. A decision that has been adopted notes that the work underway in the country to implement the directives of the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum and of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions, and the working people's active participation in the implementation of the party's course to accelerate social and economic development have yielded positive results in the fulfillment of the state plan tasks during the first half of 1986.

The volume of industrial production has gone up by 5.6 percent, the annual goal being 4.3 percent. All union republics and ministries, apart from the Ministry of Petroleum Industry, have fulfilled the plan. Seven billion rubles' worth of additional output has been marketed. There have been certain improvements in the main branches of industry: the metallurgical, engineering, coal-mining, and gas industries. The machine-building complex is developing at an advanced rate. Production of machinery which determines the acceleration of scientific and technological progress is going up.

Production of modern computer systems, machining centers, rotor conveyer lines, flexible modules and industrial robots, forging press machines with numerical program control, and of a number of other types of highly productive equipment has gone up between 1.5 and 2 times.

All types of transport are more strict in ensuring that tasks concerning freight transportation are fulfilled. The rate of capital construction has gone up. In accordance with the new investments policy, worked out by the congress, work is beginning to get underway in the branches of the national economy to carry out technical reconstruction and reequipment of the existing capacities.

The restructuring of management, the transition to the new conditions of running the economy have begun to tell on the state of affairs within the agro-industrial complex.

During the first 6 months, the volume of purchases of livestock, including poultry, has increased by 7.3 percent, relative to the corresponding period last year; and of milk by 5.7 percent.

The processes of making use of the intensive factors of development are gathering momentum in the national economy. The tasks concerning the growth of labor productivity, of profits and the lowering of own costs have been overfulfilled.

Deliveries of output within the framework of contractual commitments are improving. The level of fulfillment of tasks concerning the range of goods has gone up.

All of this testifies to the fact tha a good start has been made in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The CPSU Central Committee, having favorably appraised the positive economic trends, nevertheless drew attention to the impermissibility of any complacency or equanimity. It was noted that reorganization is still proceeding slowly in many ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises.

Acceleration is still by no means being achieved in all sectors; rythmic work is not being ensured in all links of the economy and the due upturn in the quality of output has not yet been achieved. In certain industries the plans for new equipment are not being fulfilled.

In May and June the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry of Mineral Fertilizers Production, the USSR Ministry of Light Industry, the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, and the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry permitted a drop in pace and did not meet the plan tasks for the year. In June the increase in output produced by the industry of Azerbaijan, Moldavia, Kirghizia, Georgia and certain other republics was less than the year's plan tasks. Plans for supplies by contract are not being completely fulfilled in the Ministry of the Automotive Industry, the Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, and the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper and Wood Processing Industry. The USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction, the Ministry of Construction in the Far East and Transbaykal Regions, and the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, and a considerable proportion of general construction trusts did not meet the plans for the first half-year for the commissioning of capacities.

The task for commissioning capital assets was only fulfilled by 81 percent. The situation is aggravated by the fact that in the second half-year, 7 times the number of sites at the precommissioning stage are to be handed over.

Eight railways did not meet the transportation plan in June. A worsening of the dispatch of finished products was added to the railways' own shortcoming in work. The Central Committees of the Communist parties of the union republics, kray committees and oblast committees of the party, ministries and departments have been instructed to elaborate and implement measures for unconditionally ensuring the fulfillment of the state plan and socialist obligations adopted for 1986 as a whole and also at every association and enterprise. The CPSU Central Committee has made it incumbent on party, local soviet, and economic bodies, trade union and Komsomol organizations to analyze critically the results of work for the first 6 months of the year, to elucidate the causes and map out ways of eliminating the existing shortcomings;

-- to organize in the second half-year more efficient, high productivity work for the further increasing of rates of economic and social development;

-- to proceed in this from the fact that the intensity of plan tasks will increase considerably for the output of industrial products in the third and fourth quarters.

It has been deemed necessary to formulate everywhere comprehensive plans for the renewal of production, ensuring fulfillment of the confirmed tasks for improving the technical standard of items, for introducing technology that economizes on resources, and for improving the use of production capacities and the switch to two-three shift operation of equipment.

It is the paramount task of all labor collectives and every worker to take active part in the nationwide movement for a radical improvement in the quality of output;

-- to accelerate revision and elaboration of plans for reconstruction and technical reequipment of enterprises;

-- to attain higher rates of creating and mastering new kinds of output;

-- to make up for the lagging - behind permitted in the first half-year for the plan for new equipment;

-- to pay particular attention to pulling up the industries, associations, and enterprises that are lagging behind, and to strengthening further contractual and production discipline, the rhythmic nature of work, the regimes of economy and thrift, comprehensive preparation for work under winter conditions, and building up the necessary fuel stocks;

-- to ensure a high level of fodder procurement, a further upturn in the gathering in of the harvest, especially in the eastern regions of the country; to achieve a sharp reduction in the losses sustained by land husbandry and livestock breeding production.

The CPSU Central Committee has devoted special attention to the completely intolerable cases where tasks concerning housing construction and the construction of social sphere facilities are upset in a number of the RSFSR oblasts, in Uzbekistan, Armenia, Turkmenia and other regions.

The central committees of the Communist parties of the union republics, and party kray and oblast committees are obligated to accord special political significance to the fulfillment of the social tasks of plan, tasks which have a direct bearing on enhancing the standard of life of the population; to the construction of housing, schools, hospitals, establishments for children, clubs and houses of culture, to increasing the production of consumer goods and to the development of the services sphere.

The USSR ministries and departments and the councils of ministers of the union republics have been instructed to adopt measures to find additional commodity resources to safeguard the planned volume of trade turnover, improve the organization of trade, and (?supply) food produce to the population.

The CPSU Central Committee has expressed confidence that the party organizations will direct the political, organizational, and training work to restructure the activities of the labor collectives in the spirit of the June 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, to develop initiative and creative activeness, to struggle with bureaucratic and hidebound practices, with all that impedes the acceleration of development.

Following the call in the CPSU Central Committee's appeal, the Soviet Union's working people will extensively expand nationwide socialist competition to fulfill successfully the tasks of the first year of the 12th 5-Year Plan, turning the bold plans and designs into the energy of practical action.

SHORTCOMINGS REVEALED IN FEED PROCUREMENT

PM161431 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Jul 86 p 1

[Livestock specialist M. Glinka "Agricultrual Review": "The Demand Will Be There in Winter"]

[Text] The USSR Central Statistical Administration has summed up the results of feed procurement to date. By 7 July the first crop of sown and natural grasses for hay and haylage has been cut on 31.6 million hectares. The country's farms had procured 29.7 million metric tons of hay and 30.2 million metric tons of haylage and produced 2.2 million metric tons of artificially dehydrated green feeds. A total of 26.1 million metric tons of feed units -- or 3.02 quintals per head of livestock (excluding pigs and poultry) -- had been laid in.

On most farms haymaking is proceeding faster than last year. In the RSFSR, for instance, 20 percent more grass has been cut than this time last year and 30-39 percent more in Latvia and Estonia; there is also a marked increase in the procurement of coarse and succulent feeds: 90 percent more in Estonia, 55 percent in Latvia, 36 percent in the RSFSR, 15 percent in Kazakhstan, and 5 percent in Georgia and Lithuania. Comparisons of this kind lead to the complacency of certain economic leaders -- look, they say, how we have lept ahead this year. Elsewhere, farms are being criticized for lagging behind last year's figures. I believe that both these approaches are wrong -- in feed procurement, just like in the harvest of other agricultural crops, last year's indicators should not be used as a guideline. After all, one year is not like another, the best time to harvest crops is sometimes earlier and sometimes later, and this applies to haymaking too.

This year on most of the country's European territory temperatures fell at the end of June and it rained. A great deal of precipitation, in some places in the form of snow, also occurred in the Transcaucasian republics. Meanwhile, in the farming regions of West Siberia and Kazakhstan the average air temperature was above normal there was a heatwave. In East Siberia temperatures fell toward the end of month; in Krasnoyarsk Kray and Irkutsk Oblast air temperatures fell as low as 0-7 degrees and 8-13 in the Transbaykal region, but the average temperature for the 10-day period was close to normal or just above normal and this also applied in the Far East and Central Asia.

By the end of June clover was in flower south of a line linking Petrozavodsk, Kirov, and Sverdlovsk, and grasses were flowering in the south of Arkhangelsk Oblast, Komi ASSR, and the north of Perm and Sverdlovsk Oblasts. Haymaking time had arrived here 5-10 days earlier than usual. Over most of the Ukraine and North Caucasus flower clusters formed on alfafa after the second mowing, in some places alfafa began to flower, and in southern rayons, especially on irrigated land it began to grow tall after the second mowing. In the Volga region and in the southeast of the Central Chernozem region on farms where the first mowing was completed on time, alfafa was 25 cm high, 40 cm on irrigated land, but only 8 cm on farms where mowing was delayed.

The rain that fell in the USSR's European territory improved the conditions for grass growth and farms which did not delay mowing can expect a good second feed crop. The weather also favored grass growth in most of Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan. Toward the end of the month meadow grasses and alfafa began flowering in these regions and also in Amur Oblast and the Maritime Kray.

It is obvious that the first mowing of both sown and natural grasses should have been completed in most regions by now. Unfortunately, in a number of places the mowing was delayed and it proved impossible to gather the grass before the rain came. In the RSFSR the first mowing was completed on all land only in Krasnodar Kray and Volgograd Oblast and nearly completed in Belgorod and Rostov Oblasts. The first mowing has been completed in all oblasts in Belorussia. Grasses have been cut on only one-fourth to one-fifth of the area in the Bashkir ASSR, Maritime Kray, Vologda, Kirov, Chelyabinsk, Kemerovo, and Novosibirsk Oblasts and on one-third of the area in the Karelian, Udmurt, and North Osetian ASSR's, and Kurgan and Omsk Oblasts.

In these circumstances it is extremely important to correctly start up the work of feed procurement workers and to organize it well. Just like elsewhere, what is needed here are new approaches, orginal solutions, and a skillful organization of competition. There still is too much formalism in this sphere. Take Altay Kray, for instance. A few days ago the kray organizations resolved "to declare 1 July to 1 August 1986 a month of shock labor in feed procurement in the kray." A substantial part of this resolution has been lifted, word for word, from a similar document issued last year. The changes are insignificant -- slightly more hay and haylage than last year is to be procured during this month of the current year, and -- more importantly -- while last year the proportion of procured high-grade feeds was taken into account when deciding the competition winners, this year this point has been excluded from the conditions of the competition. What a strange attitude! As a result, although the best time for this has passed, less than one-third of the planned amount of grasses has been cut in the oblast and only one-fourth of hay and 28 percent of haylage have been procured, and only 220 feed units of coarse and succulent feeds per head of livestock have been laid in all, which constitutes a mere 13 percent of the plan.

It is time to rid ourselves of these obsolete forms of competition in feed procurement. Their formalistic nature is reflected, for instance, in the fact that the timing of this kind of campaign, as a rule, bears no relation to the times which are most suitable for harvesting feed crops. Thus, measures of this kind were launched on one and the same day in Novgorod, Tomsk, and Kemerovo Oblasts, around Kalinin, and in the Khakass Autonomous Oblast. In Tuva ASSR last year the "month of shock labor" was launched in August -- clearly, rather than agricultural workers' competition, it was a question of a last-minute rush to get the work done. In Yakutiya a "2-week decisive effort" was organized at the same time, while in Voronezh Oblast the "month of shock labor" was followed by a "3-week shock labor stint", and in Krasnoyarsk Kray "2-month feed procurement stints" have been organized both last year and this year. Last year, many Krasnoyarsk farms had still not finished in August the set task of completing the first mowing of perennial grasses by 20 July. This is what happens when day-to-day intensive work is supplanted by a noisy campaign. This year history is repeating itself: grasses on the kray's farms have been cut on only 23 percent of the area, and merely one-fifth of the planned quantity of hay and...3 percent of haylage have been procured.

It must be said that at a number of places plans for feed procurement by no means cover the livestock units' requirements. And so even high target fulfillment figures do not always serve as an indicator of good work in the accumulation of feed stocks. Thus, for instance, kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Stavropol Kray having procured 4.7 quintals of feed units per head of livestock fulfilled 26 percent of their target while Dagestan farms with lower stocks per head of livestock (4.6 quintals) fulfilled 40 percent of their target.

In organizing competition in the meadows and feed crop fields only one goal must be pursued, only one criterion must be applied, and that is the provision of livestock units with their full requirement of feeds in accordance with the norms drawn up by livestock specialists.

COSMONAUTS END 125-DAY ORBITAL MISSION

Land Near Arkalyk

LD161443 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- The cosmonauts Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyev have successfully fulfilled the programme of the 125-day orbital mission and returned to earth today at 16:34 Moscow time.

The descent module of the spacecraft Soyuz T-15 landed 55 kilometres to the northeast of the city of Arkalyk. The cosmonauts are feeling fine after landing.

For the first time in the history of astronautics, one crew carried out orbit-to-orbit flights and worked at two manned orbital complexes.

The cosmonauts conducted overall tests of the elements of the structure and onboard systems of the new station Mir, tested and adjusted its equipment, fitted out additional instruments and other equipment delivered by two unmanned freight ships Progress from earth, and the Soyuz T-15 craft from the orbital complex Salyut-7 -- Cosmos-1686. The first stage of work on board the Mir station was fulfilled.

While on Salyut-7, the crew carried out diverse work in open space in order to master technological operations to be applied in the future for the construction of complicated large-scale structures in near-earth orbit. The cosmonauts completed scientific and technological studies envisaged by the programme of that station's operation.

While fulfilling the programme, the crew displayed courage and high professional skill.

The Mir station and the Salyut-7 -- Cosmos-1686 orbital complex are continuing flight in the unmanned mode.

The results of the observations and experiments conducted by Kizim and Solovyev will find broad application in various branches of science and national economy. The experience of organizing crew work on two orbital stations during one flight will be used in the operation and multi-purpose permanent manned complexes with special orbital modules.

The completion of the long-term space mission is a worthy contribution to implementing the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress on the further exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes.

TV Reports Return

LD162131 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 16 July in the "Vremya" newscast carries a 2-minute report by special correspondent Aleksander Galkin from on board a helicopter near the "Soyuz T-15" descent module landing site.

Galkin begins by explaining that the rescue teams have just received radio signals from the descent module; the aircraft rescue teams were the first to pick up the signals when flying at an altitude of 9-15,000 meters.

Three of these aircraft have retransmitters so that the signals can be heard at Flight Control Center. Galkin says that the eight aircraft in the team are now observing the parachute, shown outlined against the sky, and are descending at the same time. The video shows 3 APC's filmed from ground level moving along a road. Galkin says that crews are at the ready at Baykonur just in case but "Soyuz T-15" has now landed and helicopters are shown landing beside the parachute and module on a plowed field. Along the sides of the field a number of agricultural machines and trucks are seen speeding toward the scene to get a look at the spectacle.

Back on earth, cosmonauts Solovyev and Kizim are shown in wheelchairs still wearing space suits but with the front visors of their helmets removed. Galkin addresses Solovyev who is blinking in the sunlight and says: "Usually cosmonauts say when they return from space that they are ready to fly into space again. Are you ready to go up into space again?" Solovyev turns to Kizim and asks: "Leonya, are we ready to go up again?" Kizim replies: "We are always ready."

The cosmonauts look very pale and puffy-eyed in comparison with the tanned rescue team members gripping the backs of the wheelchairs. Kizim continues speaking: "I want to say that during three flights into space I worked 373 earth days and nights -- and for space ones you have to multiply by 16 -- I want to say that this testifies that Soviet cosmonautics is advancing and has, in my opinion, reached the stage where space has already become a working site for cosmonauts. Real work is already being done in space, not just a few experiments to show whether to carry on working further in space or call a halt." Kizim goes on to praise the great role of Soviet medicine which helped them to work in space.

Back at Flight Control Center, former cosmonaut Dzhanibekov congratulates the cosmonauts, and Leonov echoes Dzhanibekov's sigh of relief that they have returned safe and sound.

Kizim, Solovyev Decorated

LD162117 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] In recognition of successful fulfillment of the space flight on the Mir Station and the Salyut-7 -- Cosmos-1686 orbital complex, and of courage and heroism manifested thereby, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has awarded Leonid Denisovich Kizim, twice hero of the Soviet Union, pilot cosmonaut of the USSR, the Order of Lenin.

Vladimir Alekseyevich Solovyev, hero of the Soviet Union, pilot cosmonaut of the USSR, has been awarded the Order of Lenin and a second Gold Star medal. A bronze bust will be erected in the home town of Comrade Solovyev, in honor of his feat.